DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 193 CG 002 303

By-Ginger, Lyman V.; And Others
TASK FORCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION. REPORT.
National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 14 Jun 68
Note-117p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.76
Descriptors-*HIGHER EDUCATION, *PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, PROGRAM EVALUATION

A Task Force on Higher Education was established to define the role and chart the course for the National Education Association (NEA) in the field of higher education. The following areas were studied as a basis for recommendations: (1) the historic role of the NEA in higher education; (2) the principal organizations in higher education, including their methods of operation and future plans; (3) basic data on higher education for base periods (1957, 1967, and 1975), for trends and projections; (4) an identification of the alternative role available to the NEA; (5) an examination of each alternative role by means of systems analysis for the best possible information on the costs and benefits of any course of action; (6) activities in the field of higher education at the state level; and (7) possible implications for higher education of pending amendments to the NEA Constitution. Based on an analysis of the above information, a specific program of action is outlined. (IM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REPORT

TASK FORCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

A Report Prepared by the Task Force
on Higher Education for the Board of
Directors of the National Education
Association, June 1968.

CG 002 303

ED022193

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Task Force on Higher Education
Washington, D.C.
June 14, 1968

President Braulio Alonso, Members of the Board of Directors:

Your Task Force on Higher Education herewith submits its report for your consideration and action.

The Task Force was created by action of the Board of Directors in October 1967. President Alonso appointed the members of the Task Force.

"To define the role and chart a course for the NEA in the field of higher education" was the charge assigned. The assignment was a difficult one which has not been fully met. It may be several years before a role can be defined which serves adequately the mutual interest of the NEA and its members in higher education. This report, it is hoped, is a fruitful start.

The members of the Task Force appreciated this opportunity to be of service. Each member stands ready to discuss the report with all official bodies of NEA.

Respectfully,

Bruce P. Eckman
Lyman V. Ginger
Zach Henderson
Robert Phelps
John N. Terrey, Chairman

PREFACE

In creating a Task Force on Higher Education, the Board of Directors of the National Education Association was recognized the clear need to resolve a problem of long standing: What should be the role of NEA in higher education and, conversely, what should be the role of higher education in the NEA? The existence of the problem has caused sustained unrest and dissatisfaction.

So as to obtain advice based on a careful and independent study, the Board of Directors of NEA at its October 18-19, 1967 meeting authorized the establishment of a Task Force on Higher Education. Assignment to the Task Force was "to define the role and chart a course for the NEA in the field of higher education." President Braulio Alonso appointed the following individuals to serve on the Task Force:

Dr. Lyman V. Ginger
Professor of Education
University of Kentucky

Mr. Robert Phelps
Executive Secretary
California College and University
Faculty Association

Dr. Zach Henderson
President
Georgia Southern College

Mr. Bruce P. Eckman
President-Elect
Association of Classroom Teachers

Dr. John N. Terrey, Chairman
Associate Professor of Higher Education
Central Washington State College

The Task Force met at NEA Headquarters November 24-25, 1967 for the purpose of outlining the study and selecting a study director. Unable to locate a director with the background and available time, the members asked the chairman, John Terrey, to serve as study director. The first assignment given to the study director was to meet with the executive heads of the major associations in the field of higher education. Between December 11 and December 22 interviews were held with the other associations in higher education.

The members of state association staffs working with higher education and the presidents of higher education departments at the state level have been concerned about the role of NEA. In fact, representatives of this group met in Chicago in September and called for the Board of Directors to appoint a Task Force. It was natural, therefore, for the Task Force to report its plans to the state associations. On January 13-14, 1968 a meeting between the Task Force and state leaders was held in Chicago.

Naturally the major components of higher education in the NEA structure were vitally concerned with the work of the Task Force. The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and the National Faculty Association - Community Junior Colleges (NFA-CJC) worked closely with the Task Force at all points. The education which the members of the Task Force received was provided, in large part, by the leadership of these two NEA groups. Therefore, the Task Force met with the staff and officers of AAHE and NFA-CJC in Washington on February 2-3, 1968 in order to exchange views. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher

Education and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors were also represented at the meeting.

As a part of the National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by AAHE in Chicago (March 3-6, 1968), the Task Force gave a report of activities and listened to members with ideas relating to the work of the Task Force.

The last regular working session of the full Task Force was held in Washington on April 20-21, 1968. At this session the outline of the report was adopted and the study director was asked to prepare the report in writing. Final approval was to be obtained by mail.

A part of the education which the members of the Task Force received was the clear understanding that the field of Higher Education is both diversified and complex. When the rapid change of the day and the great growth of the moment are added, the difficulties in perceiving clearly the boundaries of the field become extremely acute. Even more difficult is the identification of a role in higher education for a broadly based professional organization such as the NEA. In higher education institutions are large and small; public and private; sectarian and non-sectarian; two-year, four-year, and graduate; old and new; professional, single purpose, and multi-purpose; rural and urban. Some faculty members are traditional academic, department centered, disciplined oriented and other faculty members are in new occupational fields, institutionally centered, and process oriented.

Organizations in higher education are plentiful. To a much greater degree than is true in the elementary-secondary sector, one finds a whole complex of institutional membership organizations. The "holding company" in higher education is the American Council on Education. Under its broad umbrella one finds institutional membership groups representing land grant colleges and universities, state colleges and universities, community-junior colleges, liberal arts colleges, as well as individual membership groups like AAHE and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). As though this complexity were not enough, the individual discipline groups need to be added. Staff members in higher education tend to give primary loyalty to their disciplines. Hence, their urge to join a professional organization is often satisfied with membership in the Modern Language Association or the American Chemical Society. The centrality of these groups to higher education can be understood more fully when one accepts the fact that tenure and promotion are won primarily through achievements related to the disciplines.

All of these factors have made it difficult to comprehend higher education from an organizational point of view. They have -- and will -- make it extremely difficult to organize higher education. Today there are 283,000 instructional staff members in higher education on a full-time basis. If one group were to be as successful in recruiting instructional staff from the higher education sector as the NEA has been in the elementary-secondary sector, the results would mean only about 145,000 members. Even by 1975, the figure would be only 190,000. Thus, it can be seen that recruitment is extremely difficult and that the numberical results are relatively small. Therefore, activity must be based on some factor other than membership potential. Perhaps an answer might be found in the contribution which members from higher education can make and are making to the programs of the NEA. What then should be the NEA's contribution to higher education? It has been primarily to this point that the Task Force devoted its labors and thoughts.

In a study concerned with a problem as complex as the role of higher education, no task force working with limitations of time and resources could hope to make any careful analysis without the thoughtful guidance and help of many individuals outside the membership of the Task Force. The members express warmest appreciation to Dr. Lyle Ashby, Deputy Executive Secretary of the NEA, who met with the Task Force at every session, who made the endless arrangements essential to the operation, and who provided judicious counsel when asked. The Research Division of the NEA helped with the research and collection of data. Especially to Dr. William Graybeal for two valuable background papers and for many hours of meetings, does the Task Force express its appreciation. To the executive heads of groups within the NEA structure working in the area of higher education go the thanks of the Task Force. Their knowledge and their cooperation were invaluable assets. To William Hinkle and Professor Ernest Miller of the Graduate School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington a debt of gratitude is owed for the careful application of system analysis to the pattern of alternative purposals the Task Force considered.

Finally, it is necessary to admit that the merits of the report reflect the help received; none of the many individuals outside the membership of the Task Force is expected to assume any responsibility for the errors of commission and omission readers will note in the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL II

PREFACE III

LIST OF TABLES VIII

I. HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE WORLD OF NEA 1

The Historic Role
The Role of Higher Education in the NEA

II. HIGHER EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS IN THE NEA 6

The American Association for High Education
The National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges
The National Association of Women Deans and Counselors
The American Association of Colleges for Teachers Education
Postscript

III. THE WORLD OF HIGHER EDUCATION 18

American Council on Education
National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
Association of State Colleges and Universities
Association of American Colleges
American Association of Junior Colleges
American Association of University Professors

IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION RELATING TO THE MEMBERSHIP POTENTIAL FOR A PROFESSIONAL ORGANZATION OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL EMPLOYED IN HIGHER EDUCATION 25

Student Population
Projections of College Enrollments
Estimates of Faculty Size
Distribution of Faculty by Teaching Fields
State-wide and National Coordination in the Future
Professional Associations in Higher Education
Professors and Collective Action

V. ACTIVITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION REPORTED BY STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS, 1967-68 48

Specific Activities
Services Most Attractive
Problems in Higher Education

IV. POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS OF PENDING AMMENDMENTS 63

VII. WHAT SHOULD BE THE ROLE OF NEA IN HIGHER EDUCATION..................66

Higher education growth: Membership Potential
Present Involvement of UEA in Higher Education
Present Involvement of NEA Affiliated Organiztions
The AAUP
The Issue of NEA's Future Role in Higher Education

VIII. A PROPOSAL OUTLINING A ROLE FOR NEA IN HIGHER EDUCATION............ 72

Basic Assumption
Other Assumptions
Attachment A
Attachment B

APPENDIX.. 81

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Attendance at Annual National Conference on Higher Education....... 8

2. Grand Totals -- 22nd National Conference on Higher Education....... 8

3. Estimates and Projections of the Total Population of the United States, 1950 to 1980, Five-year Intervals, Age 15-19 and Age 20-24.. 32

4. Enrollment by Grade in Full-time Public Ellementary And Secondary Day Schools: United States, 1954-55 and 1965-1966......... 33

5. Projections for Fall College Enrollments............................ 34

6. Projections of Enrollment, Four-year Colleges and Universities, 1965-1985.. 35

7. Total Opening Fall Degree-Credit and Estimated Nondegree-Credit Enrollment in all Institutions of Higher Education/............. 36

8. Total Opening Fall Degree-Credit Enrollment in 4-year Institutions and 2-year Institutions of Higher Education...................... 37

9. Full-time Instructional Staff, Instructor or Above, and Total Instructional Staff, for Resident Degree-Credit Courses in Institutions of Higher Education............................ 38

10. TOtal Demand for Estimated Full-Time Equivalent Institutional staff in Institutions of Higher Education......................... 39

11. Number and Percent of Full-time Professional Staff, October 1963; Estimated Additional Number Needed Exclusive of Replacements, November 1963 - October 1969, in Higher Education.. 41

12. Distribution of AAUP Members and Teaching Faculty, and Estimated Percent of Teaching Faculty Represented by AAUP Membership,1963. 43

13. Teaching Faculty in Universities and 4-year Colleges by Principal Teaching Area and Selected Institutional Attributes: Aggregate United States, Spring 1963.............................. 44

14. Faculty in Universities and 4-year Colleges Distributed by Principal Teaching Area, by Type of Institution... 45

15. AAUP Membership Compared with Full-time Instructional staff for Residential Instruction in Degree-Credit Courses, and Estimated AAHE Membership, 1949-50 to 1966-67................ 46

16. Membership, Total Expenditure, and Expenditures per member of AAUP and AAHE, 1961-62 through 1966-67........................ 47

17. Policy and Program for Higher Education Reported by 48 State Education Associations.. 49

18. Selected Characteristics of Higher Education in States Grouped by the Extent of State Education Association Involvement Planned in Higher Education.. 53

19. Selected Characteristics of Activities of State Education Associations in Higher Education.............................. 54

20. Activities Practiced by State Education Associations and the Evaluation of their Potential Effectiveness in Serving the Interest and Needs of Persons in Higher Education............. 57

21. Services Found to be Most Attractive to Members in Higher Education as reported by State Associations............................ 60

22. Major Problems Confronting State Associations in Higher Education as Reported by the State Associa; ions........................ 61

23. State Education Associations and Their Group Placement Based on Their Policy Regarding Higher Education.................. 62.

24. Membership of Higher Education in the NEA, 1967-68................. 70

25. NEA Expenditures Related to Higher Education, 1967-68............. 70

26. Total Percentages - Membership and Expenditures, 1967-68.......... 70

I. HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE WORLD OF NEA

A quick glance at the current situation reveals quite clearly that the NEA is faced with a major policy decision affecting its role in higher education. Either the NEA must face up to the need of investing substantially larger sums of money into higher education in order to provide adequate services to faculty and administrators or it must compute the cost of getting out of higher education. Between these two extremes are other alternatives. Within each alternative pattern is a need for an organizational pattern, including the identification of needs, establishment of goals for a multi-year plan, development of objectives and priorities, preparation of a program structure, and application of measures of results.

Before the Task Force could prepare a specific recommendation, it was necessary to complete as thorough an analysis of the history, problems, and possible future courses as time permitted. Such an analysis included the following steps:

1. An examination of the historic role of the NEA in the field of higher education.

2. An examination of the principal organizations in the field of higher education, including their methods of operation and future plans.

3. An examination of the field of higher education through the collection of basic data for base periods - 1957, 1967, and 1975. These data, covering the field over a twenty year period, provided the Task Force with trends and projections.

4. An identification of the alternative roles available to the NEA in the field of higher education.

5. An examination of each alternative role by means of systems analysis so as to provide for the Task Force and the decision-makers in NEA the best possible information on the costs and benefits in any course of action.

6. An examination of activities in the field of higher education at the state level through means of a survey.

7. An examination of the possible implications for higher education of pending amendments to the NEA Constitution, especially Amendment #15 and Amendment #16.

8. Finally, based on the studies indicated above, the Task Force prepared a specific program of action for the consideration of the NEA and its higher education components.

The Historic Role

While higher education was one of the original departments in the 1870 formation of the National Education Association, it is also significant to recall that in 1924 the Board of Directors of the NEA discontinued the department. Later, in 1942, the NEA voted to reinstate the Department of Higher Education. Therefore, it can be observed that a department representing higher education has been out as well as in the NEA structure. A brief history follows.

The National Teachers' Association, which was to become the National Education Association, was founded in Philadelphia on the 26th day of August, 1857. Thomas W. Valentine of New York and Daniel B. Hagar of Massachusetts, both presidents of their state associations, issued the first call. Hagar, later to serve as president of the national group, was then principal of the Normal School at Salem, Massachusetts. In Cincinnati the following year, Daniel Read, professor of mental philosophy, University of Wisconsin, delivered one of the major addresses.

From that moment to this, the interest and participation of members of higher education in the activities of the NEA have exceeded what their numbers would indicate.

Cleveland was the setting of the convention in 1870. Here the National Education Association was formed from the National Teachers' Association. There were four original departments; the Department of Higher Education was one. The antecedent was the Central College Association organized in 1869. Thus, the NEA was confronted with the federation question --that of coordinating associated departments, a problem with remarkable survival. President Eli T. Tappan of Kenyon College expressed the view at the time that the departments were not to be separated but joined "by a conjunction and never by a disjunctive conjunction." President Hagar, speaking of the four departments in 1870, said: "We can preserve the advantages of each, and at the same time establish on a broad foundation an organization grand in its proportions, comprehensive in its objects, and powerful in its operations."

The NEA Department of Higher Education continued but with faltering steps until, in 1924 after several years of low interest, the Board of Directors discontinued the department "inasmuch as this field is adequately covered by other national organizations." Other national organizations included the American Council on Education in 1918 and the American Association of University Professors in 1915. When the American Council on Education was formed, one of its fourteen founding organizations was the National Education Association as were two NEA units: the National Council on Education and the Department of Superintendence. Today the American Association for Higher Education of NEA is a constituent organization member.

Wesley speaks of the decision to disband as follows:

> The disbanding of the Department and the relative neglect of higher education occurred in a period when the NEA was concentrating its attention upon teacher welfare and the public schools. This

> withdrawal, however, was unfortunate for higher education and for the NEA. There was no unifying organization where the problems that confronted all kinds of colleges and universities could be discussed. None of the associations of colleges, of professors, or of scholars, in the various subjects, met the need of a national clearing house for discussion and planning.

Mildred Fenner reports subsequent concern as follows:

> After Willard E. Givens became Executive Secretary, he looked over the records of the deans, and started to name deans of education that were really active in the NEA. "I have not yet used up all the fingers on one hand," he told the National Council in 1935. The main reason for this, he thought, was that the NEA had not rendered particular service to schools of education. "If we can render service, we shall get fine cooperation."

In 1942, the NEA voted to reinstate the Department of Higher Education. The Department was reorganized in 1943. Beginning with 1946 the Department started the series of conferences on higher education for which it is justly famous. The most recent issue of the conference - Current Issues in Higher Education - carries the title In Search of Leaders. For the 1968 conference the theme was "Stress and Campus Response."

In addition to the Department of Higher Education, which became the Association for Higher Education in 1952 and, in 1967, the American Association for Higher Education; the NEA has had other units operating in the field of higher education. In 1918, the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors became an NEA department. In 1925, the American Association of Teachers Colleges (now the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education) became a department of the NEA. Finally, in 1967 the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges was formed -- the first national membership organization composed solely of community and junior college faculty members. The NFA-CJC is a special project of the NEA; its ultimate position in the organizational structure has not been defined.

The Role of Higher Education in the NEA

Basic to any decision relating to a future role for higher education in the NEA is an examination of the present role of the involvement of higher education in the activities of the NEA. Higher education is involved in virtually every phase of activity in the Association. Principal departmental involvements include: the American Association for Higher Education, the National Faculty Association (a Special Project), the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE has institutional membership), the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, the Association for Student Teaching, the Student NEA, and many of the activities of TEPS.

Since all members of the NEA who work in the field of higher education are automatically members of the American Association for Higher Education, the total enrollment in AAHE should provide the number of individuals from higher education who are members of the NEA. Exact figures are difficult to ascertain under the present system, but 24,000 seems to be a figure most parties can accept. This means that about 2.43 per cent of the total NEA membership is from higher education.

An analysis of the involvement of representatives from higher education in the structure and activities of the NEA follows:

I. NEA Membership - 1,028,456 (1966-67)
AAHE Members - 24,000 in over 1,600 institutions
Percentage of members from higher education - 2.43

N.B.: The 24,000 is based upon a rather careful examination of membership records. John H. Starie, director of affiliates and membership, agrees with the figure. If in error the error is on the conservative side. Frankly, NEA has never been able to identify reliably the members from higher education.

Recently, in listing activities of an imperative nature, Kenneth H. Hansen who was project coordinator for the NEA Development Project, said: "It is imperative that the enrollment and record-keeping processes be improved so that the NEA members whose primary interest is in higher education can be quickly and accurately discovered and listed."

II. a. No information is available on the number of members from higher education participating in the annual representative assembly of the NEA. Of the 6,596 members attending the Minneapolis meeting, only a very few were from higher education. One informal search of the advance list of delegates revealed only 24 from higher education. While that figure may be too low, there were less than 168 which would be the percentage of total delegates equal to the percentage of higher education members to total NEA membership. Higher Education is under-represented at the delegate assembly.

b. The Board of Directors of the NEA is made up of 94 members, including all the members of the Executive Committee. There are seven members (7.45 per cent) of the Board of Directors from institutions of higher education. Specifically:

1. Irvamae Applegate, immediate past president, NEA; dean, School of Education, St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minn.

2. Lyman V. Ginger, treasurer, NEA; College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

3. C. Frank Newell, director, Gadsden Center, University of Alabama, Gadsden, Ala.

4. Zach S. Henderson, president, Georgia Southern College, Collegeboro, Ga.

5. Herbert V. Everly, dean, Teachers College, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii.

6. James M. Lynch, Jr., dean of students, Glassboro State College, Glassboro, New Jersey.

7. John F. Montgomery, president, Greenbrier College, Lewisburg, West Virginia.

c. The Executive Committee of the NEA is made up of eleven (11) members, including the officers and the chairman of the Board of Trustees. Two members -- Irvamae Applegate and Lyman V. Ginger -- are from higher education.

d. The Board of Trustees of the NEA is made up of five members. Two members -- Lois V. Edinger and Irvamae Applegate -- are from higher education. (Miss Edinger is assistant professor of education, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina.)

e. There are six officers of the NEA, including the executive secretary and the deputy executive secretary. Two members -- Irvamae Applegate (immediate past president) and Lyman V. Ginger (treasurer) -- are from higher education.

In the early days of the NEA many of the presidents were influential figures in higher education. The list includes such names as Nicholas Murray Butler, Charles W. Eliot, David Starr Jordan, and George D. Strayer. Since 1946 there have been four presidents of NEA who were serving in higher education at the time of their election.

III. a) Officers of NEA departments from the field of higher education. There are thirty-three (33) departments within the NEA structure. (For a complete list of officers, purposes, activities, membership figures, and dues, see the NEA Handbook - 1967-68, p. 151 ff.) There are 273 officers, editors, regional directors, and members of executive committees for the thirty-three departments of NEA. This figure excludes all staff members. Of this total (273), one hundred thirty-four (134) are members from the field of higher education -- 49.08 per cent.

II. HIGHER EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS IN THE NEA

One reasonable manner by which an association can examine its efforts is to look at its programs rather than at its departmental structure. For example, one cannot hope to obtain a complete view of the role the Federal Government plays in education by studying the U.S. Office of Education. There are forty-two separate agencies in the Federal Government involved in education. A program analysis includes them all regardless of the authority under which they operate.

When applied to higher education within the NEA structure, one discovers that it is necessary to go beyond AAHE and NFA. For example, there are also the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Student NEA, the many facets of TEPS, the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, the NEA involvement in the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and -- as noted previously -- the great involvement in discipline departments housed in the NEA structure as departments.

Nonetheless, AAHE and NFA are the primary individual membership departments within the NEA which restrict membership to people in institutions of higher education. Therefore a more detailed examination of these two departments is in order.

The American Association for Higher Education

In 1870 when the Department of Higher Education became a department of the NEA, there were 170 active members in the NEA. The population of the United States was 31,443,321. During its early history, the list of presidents includes most of the illustrious names in higher education; however, for the purposes to be served now, the history covers that period from 1942 to present. At the Denver Convention of the NEA in 1942 the Department of Higher Education was reinstated without discussion by a vote of the delegates. During the 1930's, a special Committee on Higher Education was created "to promote a closer liaison between the faculties of colleges and universities and the NEA." (Note the word "faculties.")

Today the AAHE Constitution states: "It shall be a self-governing department of the National Education Association." It should also be noted that AAHE and the Association of Classroom Teachers receive full financial support from the NEA.

Membership is 24,000 by a rather careful count and dues are $10 per year, which provides concurrent membership in NEA. (As of September 1, 1968 the dues will become $15.) The budget for 1967-68 is $200,000. These figures suggest that AAHE generates about $240,000 for the NEA and receives in return $200,000; however, the department also receives office space, records assistance, services from many of the NEA divisions such as Research and Publications. The moving force for reinstating the Department was Alonzo F. Myers. Professor Myers was on leave from New York University in 1940-41. He visited colleges all over the nation as a member of an accreditation team. He concluded that higher education "had little cohesion."

Each segment -- public colleges, private colleges, church controlled colleges, teachers colleges, professional schools -- was engaged in trying to protect its own interests and not greatly interested in protecting the others. There was no organization to command the loyalties or serve as a unifying force for the thousands of college and university teachers and administrative workers. The NEA . . . was not strong enough or militant enough to protect anything or anybody. The solution as Professor Myers perceived it was to develop a unified profession -- kindergarten through the graduate school. In 1941-42 about one in five of the members of the profession were members of the NEA.

Myers decided to try to re-activate the Department. He personally typed more than 700 letters to NEA members active in higher education. A petition was signed by 503 faculty members of 30 colleges and universities and one junior college from 18 different states. Mr. Fred D. Cram of Iowa made the official motion at the Denver Convention in 1942. Without discussion it was adopted.

Myers reports that following his letter of invitation, he received a letter from Dr. George F. Zook, President of the American Council on Education, objecting to the re-establishment of the department on the grounds that higher education was adequately covered by the ACE. The American Association of University Professors, of which Myers was a member, also stated objection. The fears of these groups seem to have disappeared over the years as the executive officers of both organizations speak favorably today of AAHE. Subsequent to the Denver Convention the organizational meeting was held in St. Louis (1943) under difficult war time conditions. Herman B. Wells, President of Indiana University was chosen president of the Department. On December 1, 1944, Ralph W. McDonald was appointed the first full-time executive secretary. That same month the Department moved into the NEA Headquarters.

Alonzo Myers made the following comment about NEA support during the early years:

> The National Education Association has been very generous in its support of the Association for Higher Education. In 1944 the NEA Executive Committee voted to make $10,000 a year available to the Department for five years for assistance in underwriting the departmental budget, and employment of an executive secretary and a headquarters staff.

Nineteen forty-six saw the first national conference held in Chicago. The subject was veterans' affairs. Attendance was 316. The 22nd National Conference on Higher Education, also held in Chicago, examined many facets of the problem of leadership. Its speakers' platform was occupied by Barbara Tuchman, author; Nevitt Sanford, Stanford; Jesse M. Unruh, Speaker, California Assembly; Launor F. Carter, System Development Corporation; Douglass Cater, Special Assistant to the President of the United States; Samuel B. Gould, Chancellor, State University of New York; Albert Quie, U.S. Representative, Minnesota; Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr., American Council on Education; Philip Werdell, Moderator Magazine; and many many more.

TABLE 1

ATTENDANCE AT ANNUAL NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Year	Attendance	Year	Attendance
1946	316	1957	957
1947	506	1958	1,040
1948	560	1959	1,118
1949	699	1960	1,281
1950	847	1961	1,457
1951	895	1962	1,359
1952	721	1963	1,300
1953	719	1964	1,400
1954	805	1965	1,800
1955	780	1966	2,100
1956	959	1967	2,688

TABLE 2

GRAND TOTALS - 22nd NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

A.	Representatives from colleges and universities (Including foreign)		2,271
B.	Number of colleges and universities represented (including foreign)	779	
C.	Representatives from organizations		489
D.	Organizations represented	203	
E.	Less individuals listed twice		19
F.	Total: Colleges, universities, and organizations	982	
G.	Total: Participants		2,688

The purposes of the American Association for Higher Education are set forth in the Constitution.

> The American Association for Higher Education is a professional organization of faculty members administrators, trustees, and others concerned with American higher education.
>
> The purposes of the Association are to advance the professional development of those engaged in higher education and to help in making colleges, universities and related agencies increasingly effective in their service to society. The American Association

for Higher Education is unique among national associations in this field in that it brings together, on an individual basis, interested persons from the several disciplines and types of colleges and universities as well as others who seek to extend and improve higher education. Membership is on an individual, not an institutional basis.

The governing board of AAHE is the Executive Committee. Including the president, past president, and president-elect, the Executive Committee is composed of twelve members. Three members are elected each year for three year terms, two are chosen by the membership and the third by the Executive Committee "to provide a broad representation of American higher education."

AAHE carries on a variety of activities in addition to the national conference, including the Campus Governance Project, Media Survey, Arts Project, and Teaching Awards Survey. (For a description of these projects see NEA Handbook, 1967-68, p. 175). College and University Bulletin is a regular newsletter of AAHE. Annually the publication Current Issues in Higher Education presents the major speeches and reactions of the national conference.

Membership is very difficult to identify since membership is concurrent with NEA membership; however, both the AAHE and the NEA agree on a figure of 24,000, which is the result of a rather exacting examination of membership records in the NEA office. Many states, in signing members require no designation of position in education; hence, the home address which is often used does little to identify the type of position held. Some states -- Oregon and Washington, for example -- provide a place on the membership card for the member to designate his position.

What membership information is available does show a steady growth. In 1944 the membership was only 340. By 1964 the figure had risen to 19,850 and now to 24,000.

The principal problem confronting the AAHE in its relations with the NEA revolves around program. The NEA is a viable membership organization. It does not attract and hold members because it provides prestige. It must serve members directly in a manner in which the members wish to be served; therefore, the changes -- especially in recent years -- have been dramatic and are continuing. With such a history it is not surprising that the NEA does not comprehend the emphasis placed upon a national conference by the AAHE. However, the AAHE would like to expand its operations to assist states in developing campus chapters. It would like to expand the welfare services to its members. It would like to move aggressively in problem areas such as new media, research dissemination, professional negotiations, salary negotiations, and a great host of problems central to the campus. However, AAHE does not want these programs at the expense of a first-rate national conference. Without a sizable increase in budget from the NEA and, therefore, a larger staff, these new areas of demand cannot be serviced. Therein lies the crux of the problem.

National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges

The National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges is the newest member of the NEA family, recognized by official action of the NEA Convention in Minneapolis on July 6, 1967. It is the first professional organization on a national basis for faculty members in the two-year college field.

The NFA came into being after two years of serious and strenuous study by many concerned educators. Through a helping hand from AAHE and Urban Services, the group drew up a set of bylaws, elected officers, and appointed an executive director. At the present time, NFA is a special project of the NEA and is, therefore, related directly to the Office of the Executive Secretary. For 1967-68 the project was funded for $75,000. (See NEA Financial Reports - 1967, p. 17, Item N.2) A subsequent appropriation was granted for $7,000 making a total appropriation from the NEA $82,000.

Membership

Membership dues in NFA are $20, which includes membership in the NEA and AAHE. At the present rate of growth the organization should close its first year of operation with a membership of 500. Speaking informally at the charter assembly in Minneapolis, Dr. Sam M. Lambert said:

> The program of this organization is appropriately oriented to the individual faculty member rather than to the institution. I think that within five years we will have created a powerful new force in education. The NEA views its support of this association as another real investment in the freedom and integrity of the total teaching profession.

Eligibility for membership as set out in printed material is as follows: "You are eligible for membership in NFACJC if you are a faculty member (instructor or related professional, e.g., counselor, librarian) at a community or junior college and if you are (or become) a member of the National Education Association."

Purposes

In the bylaws the objectives are set forth in Section I:

A. Improve the professional effectiveness, personal welfare and working conditions of faculty personnel serving in the community and junior colleges.

B. Express the viewpoint of the faculty in community and junior colleges on matters of policy or legislation affecting these institutions at the local, state, and national levels.

C. Provide for the review, research, analysis and dissemination of information needed for the development of policy and professional standards in the community and junior colleges.

D. Initiate and cooperate in the development of policies and programs which are designed to improve the professional competence and effectiveness of faculty personnel in community and junior colleges.

E. Establish the unique identity of the profession of teaching at the community and junior college level.

F. Provide local, state and national associations which will guarantee representation of community and junior college faculty in the development of standards for the profession of teaching in these institutions.

Governance

Policy is made by the Delegate Assembly which meets once a year. Policy adopted will guide the work of the Board of Directors composed of eight members who are to be elected by the Delegate Assembly for three year terms. Officers are: President, Vice-President (President-Elect), and Executive Director. Election is by mail ballot for officers, by delegates for the Board of Directors, and by the Board of Directors in the case of the Executive Director. The first president is Alan G. Stratton of Miami-Dade Junior College (Florida) and the Executive Director is Robert W. Miner. A list of the members of the Board of Directors can be found in the NEA Handbook, 1967-68, p. 114.

Activities

During this initial year of operation the only professional employee is the Executive Director, and his efforts have been primarily devoted to establishing the office and working through state associations for the purpose of explaining the new organization.

A newsletter -- "NFA Reports" -- has been started. The first issue is a six page publication with hard news stories and photographs.

At this early date the committee system has not begun operation. Provision for committees, method of appointment, and means of reporting are outlined in the bylaws.

Comments

The first question of concern relating to the NFA is: Where does the organization belong within the NEA structure? As a special project it has no home as an ongoing part of the NEA structure. At the moment it is related to AAHE, but the differences in purpose make the two groups incompatible under the present structure. AAHE has provided a professional program for its members. NFA plans to organize two-year college faculty members at the grassroots and to stress an action program in welfare and policy matters at all levels. For example, AAHE has no formal program to provide for state affiliates or for campus chapters. These facets are central to the NFA dream. Governance in AAHE is largely in the hands of the

Executive Committee, while the NFA places policy-making in the hands of the Delegate Assembly; therefore, members have a more direct voice in the policy of the NFA than in the AAHE. These differences are basic and result in the incompatibility of the two groups.

The second question of concern relating to NFA is: Can NFA effectively organize two-year college faculties? Most members of the faculties of community and junior colleges have had experience in elementary and secondary schools where there is a history of professional membership; therefore, the tendency is to continue the practice. However, powerful forces pull in the opposite directions. Members in higher education tend to support the discipline organization over the general membership organization. Organizations in higher education tend to be institutional in membership. Divisions between private and public institutions are not as sharply drawn in higher education. Faculties tend to be primarily concerned with internal governance and, therefore, support campus-wide organizations such as the faculty senate which have no material membership ties. Finally, for reasons which are difficult to explain, faculties of two-year colleges seek the formation of independent, unaffiliated organizations which seldom reach beyond the local campus and almost never beyond the state line.

The decision to be made here is whether or not the NEA believes that two-year college faculties can be organized within the comprehensive teaching profession. If the decision is negative, then the course of action is clear. If the decision is affirmative, the NEA must mount a vast membership campaign with the commitment of thousands of dollars annually for several years before expecting any group to become self-supporting. In addition, the NEA must be willing to make the investment while granting autonomy to the NFA -- or any other structural entity of which NFA might be the antecedent. The problem should be faced realistically. No small-scale operation will succeed. Even a large-scale, well financed, carefully designed, ably promoted, energetically lead operation will struggle for many years before a verdict is clearly rendered.

The National Association of Women Deans and Counselors

Introduction

The National Association of Women Deans and Counselors (NAWDC) is one of the 33 departments within the NEA structure. The group was organized in 1916, became a department of the NEA in 1918, and established permanent headquarters at the NEA Center in 1931. Its purpose as stated in its membership brochure is:

> "Its interests and activities center around its all encompassing purpose of service to students from the elementary grades through higher education. Its concern is for the education of all students with special attention to the needs of girls and women. To strengthen educational services and expand educational opportunities for students, NAWDC strives to improve the professional competence of its members, and to exert a constructive impact upon the kind of education available to students."

NAWDC is a member of the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education -- a national organization of associations with eleven associations as members, all in the field of student personnel. Membership criteria are as follows:

1. A substantial portion of the members of the association must be employed by colleges and universities.
2. The associations must be nationally organized groups.

At the present time, NAWDC has a membership of approximately 17 per cent are also members of NEA. Almost one-third of the membership hold position in secondary schools. Dues are $20 per year -- as high as any other department dues in the NEA. In her final speech last March as president of the association, Martha Peterson, dean of students at the University of Wisconsin, addressed herself to the NEA-NAWDC relationship:

> NAWDC's closest relationships are of course with the National Education Association. We receive our office space free in the NEA Headquarters building in Washington. We participate in their job classification and fringe benefit policies. We have available to us established mailing, duplication, publication, library, and research services which we could not duplicate anywhere else. Approximately 17 per cent of our members have membership in both NEA and NAWDC, and there are those who believe that all members of NAWDC, as well as the other departments of NEA, should have mandatory NEA membership . . . We appreciate our NEA relationship, but we do not believe mandatory NEA membership is feasible for NAWDC. At this time, therefore, we anticipate discussion with NEA officers which may define our obligations to NEA, to the end that our contributions to it are more commensurate with benefits. Undoubtedly, the relationship between NAWDC and NEA will change. We shall work to keep it open, cordial, and mutually satisfactory.[1]

Organization

Dr. Miriam A. Shelden, dean of women, University of Illinois, is the president. Executive director is Miss Anna Rankin Harris.[2] Election is by mail ballot from the membership. Resolutions are acted upon by the delegates to the national convention. Attendance at the 1967 convention in Dallas was 1,017. The next convention is scheduled for Chicago, April 3-7, 1968. The major work of the four-day convention centers around refresher courses in which provocative ideas are presented for discussion.

---

[1] Martha Peterson, "NAWDC in a Time of Change", Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 30:4, (Summer 1967), 148.

[2] A list of officers and description of the department are to be found in the NEA Handbook, 1967, p. 202.

Activities

NAWDC depends upon its members for keeping the organization viable. Headquarters staff is small -- the executive director and two regular secretaries. Committees work on many of the problems confronting the association. Participation in the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education provides involvement on a cooperative level with almost all student personnel groups. Workshops on campus are promoted as a part of the program of services. These may be sponsored jointly with the college or university. In addition, a placement service is maintained.

Members are informed through a quarterly journal and an informal newsletter.

The 1966-67 Statement of Operational Account reflected receipts of $51,303.33 with $41,825.00 coming from membership dues. Expenditures were $53,268.53. The convention account provided a new profit of $1,049.00.

Comments

In the total NEA structure, the NAWDC is a small component; however, it is a busy association in a very busy field. It is the only association in the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education with NEA affiliation. The small percentage of its membership with concurrent NEA membership is disappointing. This fact accounts for the assumption expressed by the executive director that, if NEA membership were made mandatory for departmental membership, the NAWDC would be forced out of the NEA structure. This problem is common with many departments in NEA.

The question of significance is: How can NAWDC be made a more integral part of the NEA in the field of higher education?

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Background

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a department of the National Education Association. Today it is a rigorous force in shaping teacher education through its financial and moral support of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), through its annual conferences and yearbooks, and through its many fine publications covering every phase of the complex arena of teacher preparation. Wesley commented: "As a result of persistent efforts by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the national TEPS commission of the NEA, professional standards were advanced greatly between 1946 and 1955."[1]

The roots of the organization go back to 1855 when the American Normal School Association was formed in New York City. The group met with the National Teachers' Association (antecedent of the NEA) from 1866 to 1870. In 1870 the group became the Department of Normal Schools and became one of the original departments of the NEA.

---

[1] Edgar B. Wesley, NEA: The First Hundred Years, p. 351.

In 1902 a splinter group met at Emporia, Kansas to organize the North Central Council of State Normal School Presidents. Then in 1917 that group helped to found the American Association of Teachers Colleges which, in turn, joined the NEA in 1925, replacing the normal school department. By 1956 there were 314 institutional members, representing colleges of education and departments in universities. The present name was adopted in 1948.[2]

AACTE, according to its informational bulletin, is dedicated to the following goals:

1. To enable each member institution to draw upon the resources of cooperative action in continually improving its own program for the education of teachers.

2. To encourage and facilitate research and studies which will clarify appropriate objectives and identify effective procedures for teacher education.

3. To focus the attention of the general public and the teaching profession on opportunities and problems in the education of teachers.[3]

Today membership is limited to accredited institutions. There are 774 member institutions which prepare approximately 90 per cent of the new teachers. Dues vary according to the type, size, and degrees granted by the member institution. Dues range from $250 to $900. Forty-four institutions were approved for memberships in 1967.

Governance

The officers of the Association are: president, president-elect, and treasurer , who is, according to the constitution, the executive secretary. In addition there is an executive committee of thirteen members. Duties of the executive committee are outlined in the bylaws. The highest council is composed of the three official representatives of each member institution. In the case of amendments to the constitution or the bylaws each institution is restricted to a single vote to be cast by the chief liaison representative. Currently the officers are: President, John R. Emens, president, Ball State University; Vice-President, William G. Engbretson, professor of higher education, University of Denver; and Edward C. Pomeroy, Executive Secretary.

No copy of the AACTE budget was available; however, at the annual meeting the Auditing Committee gave a brief report. The gist of the report revealed a loss of $16,926.75 for 1966. (The fiscal year coincides with the calendar year) The preceding year's operation showed a net loss of $3,007.94. The report declared: "It is anticipated that the higher membership dues will place the Association on a firm financial basis for the 1967 fiscal year."[4] The presiding officer (John

---

[2] Ibid., p. 88.

[3] See also "Constitution and Bylaws", especially Article 11. The constitution is reprinted in the yearbook of the Association. For a brief outline of the AACTE organization, activities, and officers see the NEA Handbook, 1967-68, pp. 160-161.

[4] The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Changing Dimensions in Teacher Education: Twentieth Yearbook, p. 123.

King, President) after the Audio Committee report was adopted, added editorially: "I can say to you that I think we are in a sound and conservative operating position in terms of income and budget expenditures."[5]

Activities

The big event each year is the annual meeting. "Innovations and Issues in Teacher Education" was the theme this year. Of special note is the fact that six organizations will meet simultaneously with the AACTE's annual meeting: (1) The Association Organizations for Teacher Education, (2) The Association for Student Teaching (3) Laboratory School Administrators Association, (4) National Business Education Association, (5) National Society of College Teachers of Education, and (6) The Teacher Education Section for the National Catholic Education Association.

Among its most notable activities is the annual selection of the recipients of the AACTE Distinguished Achievement Awards for Excellence in Teacher Education.

Another popular activity is the consultative service which AACTE provides to member institutions upon request. The purpose of the activity is to help institutions improve teacher education programs.

Currently AACTE operates two federally funded projects: (1) The National NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth and (2) The Project to Improve Instruction in Teacher Education through the Increased and Better Use of the New Educational Media.

The "AACTE Bulletin" is used to communicate news to the official representatives of the member institutions.

Comments

(The comments below are prepared following discussion with Dr. Edward C. Pomeroy. Unless the material appears within quotation marks, it must be concluded that the words are an interpretation of viewpoints expressed by Dr. Pomeroy.)

At the outset it must be observed that this interview was the most painful of all the interviews in which this writer participated. Beyond all question AACTE is a viable force in teacher education, a concern of centrality to the NEA. Unfortunately no pattern of organization has been formed which would afford to AACTE a central place in the structure and activities of the NEA. The impression that AACTE is a step child in the NEA organization was unmistakable. "AAHE is the NEA's arm in higher education", declared Dr. Pomeroy.

There is at the present time and under the present conditions little reason for AACTE to remain a department of NEA. The belief is strongly held that there is little interest on the part of NEA to continue its relationship with AACTE. As a matter of fact, with its institutional memberships, the Association has more in common with the constituent groups of the American Council on Education. Similarly, its institutional membership tends to make the Association's ideological position antithetical to the current drive within NEA for a dynamic welfare program. Finally, if the pending amendments to the NEA Constitution which would require NEA membership as a prerequisite to departmental membership were to pass, the uneasy relationships would be terminated with AACTE's leaving NEA.

---

[5] _Ibid_.

Regardless of the outcome of the current study, the whole issue of NEA-AACTE relations should be honestly and thoroughly examined so as to strengthen the ties or to concede that the forces of division are greater than those of unity. One possible step which the NEA could consider if stronger ties are desired would be to assign the Journal of Teacher Education to AACTE.

Postscript

While the major organizations affiliated with the NEA were thoroughly reviewed and their executive officers were interviewed, it must be remembered that there are other groups active in higher education which were not so thoroughly reviewed due to the pressures of time. Included in this group are: the Student NEA, many of the activities of TEPS, and the Association for Student Teaching which will become a department of NEA in July of 1968. (The AST was founded in 1920.)

Many of the service departments of NEA devote a considerable part of their energies to higher education. These would include the Research Division and the Legislative Division.

Many departments with interests in the academic fields devote a large measure of their time and talents to higher education. Similarly, these departments draw heavily from higher education for membership and leadership.

Finally, the NEA plays a significant role in the accreditation of teacher education through its membership in the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

III. THE WORLD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

When the NEA voted to discontinue the Department of Higher Education in 1924, the reason given was that higher education was adequately served by other organizations. A question before the Task Force was: To what extent do existing organizations in higher education serve the needs of the individual member? To seek an answer, meetings were arranged with the executive heads of the major organizations. Efforts were made through interviews and through records such as publications, annual reports, and membership brochures to identify: purpose, membership, dues, financial posture, trends, role of community colleges, major concerns.[1]

Related to the investigation of the organizations was a study of the membership potential. This study attempted to collect and analyze data relating to student population, college enrollments, faculty size, distribution of faculty by teaching fields, state-wide and national coordination in the future, professional associations in higher education, and collect action.[2]

American Council on Education

The ACE is a holding company in higher education. Its membership is by institutions and organizations, not by individuals. Its stated purpose is "to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations and institutions. Membership at the present time consists of 189 national and regional associations and organizations, 1,261 institutions of higher education, and 50 affiliated institutions and organizations.

The activities of the ACE can be seen, in part, by the structure of its commissions. There are five national commissions: Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, Federal Relations, International Education, and Plans and Objectives for Higher Education.

ACE sponsors an annual conference. Papers are prepared in advance; in fact, the papers are commissioned and the writers are paid. It publishes a quarterly journal -- The Educational Record. Its Office of Research prepares annually A Fact Book on Higher Education. From time to time books are published by the Council. Recent examples are: American Junior Colleges (7th Edition) by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.; Computers on Campus by John Caffrey and Charles J. Mosmann; The Mobile Professor by David G. Brown; and Improving College Teaching by Calvin B.T. Lee.

---

[1] See Appendix A for a detailed report. This study was conducted by John Terrey and covered The American Council on Education, the Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of University Professors, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the American Association of Junior Colleges, and the American Federation of Teachers. Also interviewed was the Bureau of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education.

[2] See Appendix B for a detailed report. This study was conducted for the Task Force by William S. Graybeal, Assistant Director, Research Division, NEA.

The operating budget for this year is $2,391,800. Dues provides only 23 per cent of the receipts. Single largest source of revenue is from publications -- $653,000. Annual dues are: constituent organizations, $375 (this includes AAHE); associated organization members, $155; institutional members, $140 to $1000, depending upon the type of institution and its enrollment; and affiliates, $90.

When the ACE was founded in 1918, one of the original founders was the NEA as were two NEA departments -- the National Council of Education and the Department of Superintendence. Since Logan Wilson became president in 1961 the Council has grown rapidly. Now the Council is building a large new structure to house several national headquarters for educational groups. With the varied institutions which constitute the membership, problems of harmony are frequent. Francis Keppel in 1962 described the ACE as

> ...the largest organization for higher education. Its membership included institutions of higher learning, represented by their presidents, and groups such as the Association of Land Grant Universities and the Association of Urban Universities, which have subgroups for their members. Like NEA, ACE is troubled with a changing membership, though to a lesser degree. An additional problem for ACE is the range of its constituencies; among its members are the smallest colleges and the largest universities, as well as both public and private institutions.

Some of the top leaders in ACE have argued for a faculty voice in the Council. While the learned societies serve the narrow interests of the individual faculty member, the collective voice seeks a role in campus governance for which there is no dominant organization at present. Logan Wilson personally prefers an AAUP-AAHE type in preference to the adversary role which guides AFT thinking. An article by Harry A. Marmion of the Council appeared in the Educational Record for February, 1968. This article might be thought of as the position paper of the Council. Certainly it is a warning to the Council members. The main thesis is that collective action is coming and soon. It is thought that the appeal will be primarily to community college faculty and to former teacher colleges now state colleges. In this light it is not surprising that Logan Wilson believes that a merger of AAUP and AAHE would be helpful. If such a merger is realized, can it be done within the NEA structure?

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

The NASULGC is the oldest organization of institutions in higher education; it was founded in 1887. Membership is institutional. There are 99 members -- 68 land-grant institutions and 31 state universities. While its membership is small, its prestige is high. Enrollments include the largest colleges and universities in the country. Since it was re-organized in 1963 it has lost much of the "cow college" flavor formerly association with the group.

The purpose, as stated in the constitution, is:

> The purpose of the Association shall be the consideration of questions relating to the promotion of higher education in all its phases in the universities and Land-Grant colleges

> of all the states of the Union, and the discussion of such questions and formulation of such plans, policies, and programs as may tend to make the member institutions of the Association more effective in their work.

Budget figures call for an expenditure this year of $208,868.40, about the same as the AAHE budget expenditures. Dues are $550 per member institution plus $85 per thousand students enrolled.

Russell I. Thackrey, the executive director, believes that the major changes in the decade ahead include: greater involvement with the Federal government, mounting faculty unrest, and growth of unions. Related to the last two points are the problems of urbanization and bigness of educational institutions. These problems tend to isolate individuals, thereby creating unrest and resulting in organizational power to speak for individuals.

The Association generally is not involved with community colleges except that in some states such as Kentucky, Indiana, and Pennsylvania the community colleges are a part of the university system.

One concern which troubled Dr. Thackrey is whether NEA through AAHE can represent all of higher education -both public and private - while speaking for public elementary and secondary education. Basic to his concern was the stand taken by the NEA in opposing the Higher Education Facilities bill in 1962 on the basis that tax money should be used for public education only. This one incident has created a general impression that NEA does not understand higher education.

Association of State Colleges and Universities

If one wonders whatever became of the teacher college of yesteryear, he can find those institutions in ASCU. Eighty-three percent of the 235 member institutions started out as single-purpose teacher colleges and are now multi-purpose state colleges or universities. ASCU, formed in 1961, is new. One out of five (1,200,000) students in higher education is enrolled in an institution which is a member of ASCU. Next to the community-junior colleges this group is the most rapidly expanding segment in the field. From an organizational point of view, these institutions are ripe for individual faculty member organizations. This fact is clearly recognized by the AFT. When the institutions were teachers' colleges, the faculty members had a strong attachment to the NEA. This condition no longer prevails today. The multi-purpose nature of their operation has created a gap between the colleges and the program of the NEA. When one considers that these institutions have grown 180 per cent since 1956 and contemplate growing another 110 per cent in the coming decade, one must conclude that here is the epicenter of the action. An equally important factor is that the state colleges and universities are by far the largest single producer of teachers ; 40 per cent of the nation's new elementary and secondary teachers came from this source. All of these facts seem to suggest that these institutions should be of the greatest concern to the NEA because they stand to help or hinder the NEA in its reach to achieve its goals.

The constitution declares that it shall be the principal purpose of the Association:

1. To improve higher education within its member institutions through cooperative planning, through studies and research on common educational problems, and through the development of a more unified program of action, and

2. To provide any other needed and worthwhile educational service to the colleges and universities it may represent.

Membership is institutional with dues ranging from $100 to $800 depending upon the size of the institution. The budget for 1967 called for an expenditure of $84,000 with dues producing almost all the revenue. Obviously with so modest a budget the Association cannot undertake a great many ambitious programs.

While the spokesman for the group interviewed praised the NEA, his praise was for the work being done in the elementary-secondary field. The counterpart of the NEA in higher education was -- in this person's view -- the American Council on Education. It appeared doubtful that NEA could serve well both higher education and the elementary-secondary sector. This conclusion leaves unanswered the question of the need for an individual membership organization for higher education.

Association of American Colleges

The AAC is primarily concerned with the liberal arts colleges in the United States. Founded in 1915, it helped to form the American Council on Education and is now a constituent member of ACE. About 900 colleges now hold membership in AAC.

The purpose of the Association as stated in the constitution:

> ...shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges of liberal arts and sciences which shall become members of this association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.

Membership is institutional with each member institution limited to a single vote. Dues range from $250 for institutions with enrollments up to 500 to $350 for institutions over 2000 students. The last budget authorized expenditures of $192,200 but the total assets were $652,237.25. At the present time dues payments are failing to meet operating costs.

Dr. Richard H. Sullivan, president of AAC, expressed a need to recognize the unity of higher education. By unity he meant the mutual efforts of public and private colleges. The Federal government has recognized the unity. Implicit was the hope that the NEA had also recognized the unity. Similarly, it could be pointed out that many states discovered a unity which is reflected in financial support and by membership on statewide coordinating councils. Obviously the segment of higher education which Dr. Sullivan speaks for includes many small but excellent colleges which are hard pressed to meet the rising costs of operations. Their importance is not doubted; their survival is.

The American Association of Junior Colleges

From a feeble and faltering start in 1920 the AAJC has grown to become a very active and very large organization. There can be no doubt but what this organization is at the center of the busiest sector in higher education. Today there are 951 community-junior colleges. Each state has at least one institution and

California leads the nation with 87 colleges. Seventy-four new colleges opened this year. Enrollment has doubled during this decade.

The community-junior college faculty member may well decide the future role of NEA in higher education. An unpublished opinion poll conducted by the Research Division in 1965 indicated that 63.4 per cent of the community-junior college faculty members favored professional negotiations or collective bargaining as means for developing faculty salary and welfare policies. Only 46.1 per cent of their colleagues in senior institutions agreed. The last three years have seen an increase in negotiation activity at the community-junior college level.

It is obvious that the AFT recognizes the restless impatience of the faculty member in the two-year college. The recognition has carried with it large sums of money for organizational work. The NEA has been slow to recognize the fact that the two-year college is a unique entity in education and requires a unique program of services. The late entry has made the task more difficult.

Another facet of the membership problem in the two-year college is the drive to establish independent faculty associations on both a campus and statewide basis. These independent associations are not affiliated with either the NEA or the AFT. They are encouraged by the AAJC.

Membership in AAJC is institutional although there has been a strong drive in recent years to include faculty representation. Currently there are 704 institutional members.

According to its constitution AAJC shall:

> ...promote the sound growth of community and junior colleges and shall help create in them an atmosphere conducive to learning. Thus we will direct our activities toward the development of good teaching, suitable curriculums, effective administration, appropriate student guidance services, and communication with local, state, and national communities. We believe that through our mutual endeavors we can advance these goals.

There are five commissions in the structure with sixteen members each: administration, curriculum, instruction, legislation, and student personnel.

Each year in February an annual convention is held. This year the meeting was in Boston. Next year AAJC will meet in Atlanta. Proceedings are not published but "Selected Papers" are sent to members.

In recent years less than half the income of AAJC has come from dues. Proposed budget figures for 1967 revealed a total expected income of $700,000 of which only $200,000 will come from dues. Grants and the sale of publications have been major sources of income.

Grants have been used extensively to finance special projects. One example is the Occupational Education Bulletin designed to provide information helpful in the development of semi-professional and technical education programs. This project is supported by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

The Junior College Journal is the official publication of AAJC. It is published eight times each year and has a circulation of 21,000.

The American Association of University Professors

The largest single individual-membership organization in higher education is the American Association of University Professors. It currently enrolls about 90,000 members and appears to be going through a growth cycle. One obstacle to growth has been the indecision about membership for vocational-technical teaching personnel in the community-junior college. It now seems that the AAUP will welcome all instructors from the two-year colleges.

AAUP, like AAJC, is a constituent organization member of the American Council on Education. In fact, AAUP was one of the founders of ACE. The idea for AAUP originated with 18 full professors at Johns Hopkins University in 1913. The first meeting was held in January, 1915 with 650 professors in attendance. One of its first acts, after electing John Dewey as president, was to establish a committee on academic freedom and tenure -- subjects of sustaining concern to the Association.

Today AAUP has great influence in the areas of academic freedom and tenure. Each year the action on censure is carefully noted in the press. This year six institutions were removed from the list and nine were added bringing the new total to nineteen institutions. There can be little doubt that the placement of an institution on the list hurts the college. A censure is fought desperately. Removal from the list is a cause for celebration.

Next only to the activity on cases relating to academic freedom and tenure is the new report card on faculty salaries. The annual report card, prepared by Committee Z, is studied very carefully on every campus in the country. It is an effective and powerful instrument.

One of its brochures declares: "Vigorous in defense of academic standards and in the promotion of faculty welfare, the Association has come to be recognized as the authoritative voice of the profession."

The constitution states:

> Its purpose shall be to facilitate a more effective cooperation among teachers and research scholars in universities and colleges, and in professional schools of similar grade, for the promotion of the interests of higher education and research, and in general to increase the usefulness and advance the standards, ideals, and welfare of the profession.

AAUP has noted a growing interest in recent years in the area of professional negotiations. The Association has prepared with the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges a document Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities.

Another area of intensified action by AAUP is the strengthening of local chapters and the development of regional offices. One regional office has been established in San Francisco.

One area in which AAUP feels a need for help is college and university teaching. Some staff members stated that AAHE was ideally suited to fill this void.

In summary, the AAUP must grow in order to expand its services to meet the demands of its members. An alternative is to increase dues. This action was taken recently. Other problems perplex the Association. How wide should be its interests be? Should the Association become directly involved in campus negotiations? If it becomes involved, will it adopt an adversary posture? The latter seems antithetical to AAUP practice. Although each year a motion is made from the floor to merge AAUP with the AFT, such an action is unlikely. The two groups are very deeply divided on means, not on ends. At the present time there is a division so deep and so fundamental that the two are almost in a state of war. Certainly the organizations within the ACE structure with whom AAUP now has a warm working relationship would re-examine that relationship.

IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION RELATING TO THE MEMBERSHIP POTENTIAL FOR A PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL EMPLOYED IN HIGHER EDUCATION[1]

The following sections provide a summary of statistical information about the future growth and size of higher education in the United States. Data about the student-age population and projected enrollments,are given to provide the base for reviewing the size of the professional staff using various hypotheses about the growth of enrollments and the relation of enrollments to size of professional staff.

Student Population

Summarized in Table 3 are the most recent projections of the future numbers of persons in the intervals of age from which most college and university students are drawn. These estimates show that a period of very rapid growth in the age 15-19 group was observed between 1960 and 1965. The expected growth of this age-group in the 15 years between 1965 and 1980 will be only slightly larger than the growth observed during the 5-year period between 1960 and 1965. The 1960 to 1965 growth of 3,585,000 persons was only 242,000 smaller than the expected growth of 3,827,000 persons between 1965 and 1980.

The major surge of growth in the age 20-24 population is taking place between 1965 and 1970 with the size of this group expected to increase by about one-fourth or 3,594,000 persons during this 5-year period. After 1970 the growth rate will reduce to levels similar to those noted for the age 15-19 population five years earlier; the 10-year growth between 1970 and 1980 will be only slightly larger (by 142,000 persons) than the 5-year growth between 1965 and 1970. The growth between 1965 and 1970 is expected to be 3,594,000 and the expected growth between 1970 and 1980 is 3,736,000 persons.

The size of each of these two age-group populations will be about 21 million persons in 1980; an increase of 22.4 percent among the 15-19 age-group and an increase of 53.6 percent among the age 20-24 population over 1965 levels.

A review of the enrollments by grade levels in public elementary and secondary schools shows that the "rising tide" of growth in potential enrollment in colleges and universities reached the first years of post-high school education in 1964 with the full growth reaching the first year of college in 1965. The impact of this wave of growth in enrollments (800,000 persons) contributed by the rise in the birth-rate following World War II will pass beyond the 4-year college level by 1970. The size of the potential enrollment will be relatively stable until a small surge of between 200,000 and 400,000 additional persons reach high-school graduation beginning about 1973. (Table 4.)

---

[1] This section of the report was prepared for the Task Force by William S. Graybeal of the Research Division, NEA.

Projections of enrollments in post-high school institutions shown in the next section allow for continued growth in the percentage of school and college-age population which will be enrolled.

Projections of College Enrollments

Summarized in Table 5 are the numbers expected to enroll at the college level by 2-year and 5-year intervals between 1960 and 1980. Also shown are the two estimates of continued increase in the proportion of post-high-school-age population to be enrolled, in 5-year intervals. Information in this table shows marked growth of enrollments between 1963 and 1965 being produced by the "rising tide" of increases in the college-age population. The projected enrollment growth in any future 5-year period is not expected to be as large as that which has already been observed between 1960 and 1965.

The projection provided by Series 1 is based on an expectation that almost half (47.7 percent) of the age 18-21 population will be enrolled in college in 1980. This provides an estimate that post-high school enrollments will increase by 5,096,000 or by 83.7 percent between 1966 and 1980. The Series 2 projection shows a more conservative increase of 3,633,000 in college enrollments, an increase of about 59.7 percent between 1966 and 1980. In both of these projections the future 5-year period of largest growth will be 1970 to 1975. The number enrolled in 1975 is projected to be from 2.5 to 3.4 million larger than the 6.1 million enrolled in 1966.

Another estimate of enrollments in higher education is summarized in Table 6. The content of this projection differs from the preceding tables because it includes only 4-year institutions and it involves full-time-equivalent students as well as the total numbers to be enrolled. As in the preceding table, the largest annual increment in enrollment occurs by 1965 and the influence of the "rising tide" of population growth upon college and university enrollments is expected to end by 1969-1970.

This projection shows continuing growth in full-time-equivalent enrollments between 1970 and 1975 with enlargement during this period only about 40,000 fewer than the 1.3 million additional students predicted between 1965 and 1970. After 1975 the annual growth in the number of full-time-equivalent students is expected to reduce to about half the 1970-75 levels by 1980 and to about one-third of 1970-75 levels after 1980. The enrollment projected for 1980 in Table 6 represents a growth of 3,082,000 full-time-equivalent students over the number estimated for 1966; an increase of 73.0 percent.

The distribution of projected enrollments in institutions grouped by type and by source of control provides an indication of trends in the numbers of faculty to be employed by various types of institutions. Information in Table 7 shows that in the future the proportion of degree-credit enrollments to be housed in 4-year institutions is not expected to increase beyond 1966 levels and may decline slightly. Also, the number to be enrolled for degree-credit courses in 4-year institutions will not increase as much in the 8 years following 1967 (1,956,000 persons) as was observed in the 8 years preceding 1967 (2,550,442).

Information in Table 7 shows that while the 2-year institutions are expected to house a greater proportion of the total degree-credit enrollments, the projected growth of enrollment in the 2-year institutions in the 8 years after 1967 is about one-fourth as large as the projected growth in the numbers expected to enroll in the 4-year institutions. The projected growth of enrollments in 2-year institutions during the 8 years following 1967 is about 500,000 students.

The enrollment in non-degree credit courses represented about 7.2 percent of the degree-credit enrollment in higher education in 1966 as shown in Table 6. The projections show an expectation that this segment of higher education is not likely to involve a larger proportion of post-high school enrollments than the present levels. The projected growth in non-degree credit enrollments in the 8 years after 1967 is about two-thirds as large as the growth in these enrollments during the 8 years prior to 1967. It is projected that enrollments in non-degree-credit courses will enlarge by about 200,000 during the 8 years following 1967.

Information in Table 8 shows the projected enrollments in degree-credit classes in institutions grouped by type and by source of control. The proportion of total enrollment to be housed in public institutions is projected to rise from the 57.9 percent in 1957 and about 66.7 percent in 1967 to about 70.2 percent in 1975. Growth in the numbers to be enrolled in public 4-year institutions (1.5 million) is expected to be three times as large as in non-public institutions during the 8 year period between 1967 and 1975. In the 2-year institutions the projected enrollment growth (450,000) during the 8-year period in public institutions is 10 times as large as the added numbers projected to be enrolled in non-public institutions.

Estimates of Faculty Size

Information in Table 9 shows relatively rapid growth in number of full-time faculty having rank of instructor or above employed for resident degree-credit courses in institutions of higher education between 1961 and 1968. During no 2-year period in the years following 1967 in this table will the projected number of added faculty positions be as great as the numbers added between 1963 and 1965, and between 1965 and 1967. Growth in number of faculty between 1967 and 1969 (18,000) is projected to be about half as large as the number added between 1965 and 1967. The growth of full-time faculty in the past 8 years, between 1959 and 1967 (119,344 persons) was 35,000 greater than the projected growth of faculty in the next 8 years, between 1967 and 1975 (84,000 persons).

The number of full-time instructional staff having rank of instructor or above employed for resident degree-credit courses in higher education is projected to be 283,000 in 1967-68. During the next 8 years this number is projected to increase by 84,000 or about 30 percent of the 1967-68 size, to 367,000 persons. Not shown in the table are an estimated 141,000 faculty employed part-time for resident degree-credit courses in 1967-68; this group is predicted to enlarge to 182,000 in 1975-76.

Table 10 reveals the total demand for full-time equivalent instructional staff in institutions of higher education through 1977. It will be noted that between 1967 and 1977 a total of 445,000 additional full-time equivalent staff members will be needed. This includes 168,000 to meet the needs created by increased enrollment and 277,000 for replacements.

Distribution of Faculty by Teaching Fields

It has been suggested that interest of faculty in a general membership organization of professional personnel in higher education may not be equally prevalent among the academic disciplines and professional fields. Summarized in Table 11 are the estimated numbers of faculty in each major teaching field grouping in 1963 and the estimated numbers in 1969 as projected from information reported by a sampling of institutions. The sample included all types of institutions of higher education. The total number of full-time faculty for degree-credit courses projected in Table 11 for 1963, (209,060) is about 4,500 larger than the number reported by the U. S. Office of Education in Table 9. The number of full-time faculty projected in Table 11 for 1969 is about 25,000 greater than the number estimated for that year in line 2 of Table 9. Among the fields within the academic of degree-credit course grouping the average percent of increase in full-time faculty in the 6-year period is 56.4 percent with the percents of increase ranging from 21.8 percent in agriculture and forestry to 91.4 percent in library science.

Information which may be helpful in developing hypotheses about the higher education teaching fields in which membership potential is greatest is derived in Table 12 from membership data reported by the American Association of University Professors. Sampling errors and differences in the time period of the two numerical estimates reduce the precision of the estimated percentages of faculty in the major discipline groupings who were members of AAUP in 1963 (Column 3). Despite the wide range of error in the estimates in Column 3 the information in Table 12 suggests that potential interest in a membership organization of professional personnel in higher education may be more widespread among the faculty in the humanities and social sciences than in other disciplines. The AAUP summary estimated that these two broad groupings contained about 39.0 percent of the faculty in higher education in 1963.

An estimate of the numerical and percentage distribution of teaching faculty within each teaching area by selected institutional characteristics is listed in Table 13. This table shows, for example, that while 65 percent of the teaching faculty located in universities were in publicly supported institutions, 97 percent of university faculty teaching in agriculture and related areas were located in public institutions. Table 14 shows the percentage distribution of teaching faculty in the 4-year institutions grouped by selected institutional attributes. For example, this table shows the proportion of faculty in the combined teaching areas of English, fine arts, foreign languages, philosophy, and religion and theology amounts to about 20 percent of faculty in public universities, about 26 percent of faculty in public colleges, 24 percent of faculty in non-public universities, and about 40 percent of faculty in non-public colleges.

State-Wide and National Coordination in the Future

The following statement shows the possible future trends in the coordination of higher education beyond the institution itself.

The descriptions above of plans and planning and of the various systems for state coordination reveal that in the postwar years a marked about-face has occurred in most state systems of higher education from the near-anarchy of over a hundred years. Some major trends in the last few years are:

1. The number of state-wide voluntary coordinating agencies remains static, although their operations have broadened in scope. All of them now employ a small central professional staff.
2. A single board for governance and coordination is no longer widely adopted as a means for achieving coordination.
3. Coordinating (super) boards are rapidly becoming the principal scheme for coordination of state systems.
    a. Some have advisory powers only. ...
    b. Others have from a narrow to a wide range of powers over programs, budgets, admission standards, tuition, and other matters. ...
4. Representatives of non-public institutions are sometimes given membership on coordinating boards with advisory powers.
5. The chief function of most agencies has changed from budgeting to planning for orderly growth of higher education in the state.[1]

Paul E. Fenlon cited the variety in coordination at the state level. The trend is clearly in the direction of greater coordination. He warned his audience (the AAUP) that faculty members have much to contribute to state-wide coordination and much to gain.

> ...state-wide planning and state-wide coordination of higher education vary greatly from state to state. It is clear that there is a long history of highly centralized coordination and, indeed, control in some states. It is equally clear that there is very strong resistance to similar developments in other states. The trend toward greater coordination is unmistakable, however, and all persons who are genuinely interested in the future of higher education should recognize this fact -- and take actions they believe appropriate. Faculty members in our public and private colleges and universities, in particular, should become better informed about and more actively engaged in plans that are being

---

[1] Lyman A. Glenny, "State Systems and Plans" Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. Washington: American Council on Education, Edited by Logan Wilson, 1965, pp. 101-102.

> formulated or implemented. They have much to contribute and they, as members of the academic profession, have a responsibility to make their contributions, pointedly and persuasively.[2]

Professional Associations in Higher Education

The following quotation reviews the diversity in higher education and the extent of professional organizations:

> In each of their institutional aspects the colleges and universities belong to associations, and their interests as represented by these associations will be diverse and may even compete. In addition each school, college, or department of the university may have its national organization; nonacademic and academically related administrative units and individual staff members are organized nationally along a variety of lines -- as professors, as international specialists, as chemists, as scientists, as humanists, as English teachers, by professions, and by specialists within the professions. ...The latest issue of the U. S. Office of Education Directory, Part 4, lists some two thousand educationally related organizations, and its editor assures me there are many more that, for one reason or another, are not on the list.[3]

Information in Table 15 shows the growth in membership in two major faculty membership organizations since 1949-50. Between 1955-56 and 1966-67 the number of full-time staff almost doubled (increased by 94.0 percent), AAUP membership more than doubled (increased by 113.0 percent), and AAHE membership grew by about half (increased by 41.1 percent). The membership in AAHE represents between one-fourth and about one-third of AAUP membership.

Professors and Collective Action

Comments about the emerging nature of institutions of higher education and the characteristics of the faculty provide ideas for renewing various potential characteristics of a professional organization in higher education. William C. DeVane has suggested that the "most typical institution of higher education in 1990, as perhaps it is now, will be the state university of moderate size with a strong, active college, small but substantial graduate and professional schools, and a controlled and limited program in research for the government and for itself.[4]

---

[2] Paul E. Fenlon, "State-Wide Coordination and College and University Faculties" AAUP Bulletin, Winter, 1967, p. 409.

[3] Russell I. Thackrey, "National Organization in Higher Education," Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. Washington: American Council on Education, Edited by Logan Wilson, 1965, p. 237.

[4] William C. DeVane, "The College of Liberal Arts," in Daedalus, Fall 1964 (The Contemporary University: USA) p. 1049.

Clark Kerr has projected future conditions influencing the faculty as follows:

> Because of the competition for faculty members, salaries will continue to rise; fringe benefits of all sorts will be devised to tie professors to a particular campus. In addition to competition among universities, there is also intensified competition with industry and government. ...This current phenomenon of rising salaries and benefits, however, may be of relatively short duration, lasting, perhaps, for the remainder of this decade. Faculty salaries have been catching up with incomes in other professions after a historical lag. By 1970, also, the personnel deficit of today may be turning into the surplus of tomorrow as all the new Ph.D's roll into the market. A new plateau of compensation may be reached in the 1970's.[5]

The segment of the faculty of higher education which is most in need for collective action has been identified by Marvin J. Levine as follows:

> Professors who have done a substantial amount of important research would seem to be in a good individual bargaining position, whereas those whose ability and experience have been applied to teaching might do better under some form of collective action. In many situations, union organization would be irrelevant to faculty interests. However, since it is the most vulnerable group that derives the greatest benefit from organization, junior faculty and faculty at institutions which ignore the prestige rating within the various disciplines could probably advance their interests through collective action. Faculty whose status depends on prestige rating of a discipline or department rather than of a particular institution do better in the open market. The law of supply and demand operates in favor of tenured professors at established universities, since there is a scarcity of teachers of their calibre. However, faculty members coming from new universities and little-known colleges have less success in the acquisition of tenure or job security, adequate remuneration, and other privileges enjoyed at established institutions and achieved through individual bargaining with departmental chairmen and deans. These persons may be sympathetic to the idea of union organization and collective bargaining.[6]

The following review of the rationale for forming a campus association of faculty at the junior college level provides an indication of the potential for organization of professional staff in higher education. Norman L. Friedman reports that a local chapter of AAUP was formed in 1960 as "a concrete manifestation of both the quests for more faculty authority and greater status and identity differentiations." Reasons for selecting the AAUP as the national body to which the organization would be related included: "First, the teachers wanted an association which would be limited to and representative of only junior college teachers in the system -- an association which would differentiate them in status and identify from the system's elementary and high school teachers. Second, they wanted an association which did not include administrators in its membership. Third, they wanted an association that would be acceptable to as many faculty members as possible; ...Fourth, there were already several AAUP members in the faculty, some of whom had suggested in the past that the college ought to organize a chapter.[7]

---

[5] Clark Kerr, "The Frantic Race to Remain Contemporary," in Daedalus, Fall 1964, (The Contemporary University, USA) pp. 1053 and 1054.

[6] Marvin J. Levine, "Higher Education and Collective Action," Journal of Higher Education, May 1967, pp. 263-268; p. 267.

Table 3 -- Estimates and Projections of the Total Population of the United States, 1950 to 1980, Five-year intervals, Age 15-19 and Age 20-24.

	Age 15-19			Age 20-24		
Year	Estimated population (thousands)	Five-year increase		Estimated population (thousands)	Five-year increase	
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1950	10,685	...	...	11,680	...	...
1955	11,039	354	3.3	10,714	-966	-8.3
1960	13,467	2428	22.0	11,116	402	3.8
1965	17,052	3585	26.6	13,667	2551	22.9
1970	19,100	2048	12.0	17,261	3594	26.3
1975	20,807	1707	8.9	19,299	2038	11.8
1980	20,879	72	0.3	20,997	1698	8.8

(Population estimates are for July 1 and include Armed Forces overseas.)

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Current Population Reports, Population Estimates, Projections of the Population of the United States by Age, Sex, and Color to 1990, with Extensions of Total Population to 2015. Series P-25, No. 359, February 20, 1967. Table 4, page 14.

1950 and 1955 data from U.S. Dept. of Commerce,...P-25, No. 310, Estimates of the Population of the United States and Components of Change by Age, Color, and Sex, 1950-1960. Table 5, Page 21.

1965 data from U.S. Dept. of Commerce,...P-25, No. 321, Estimates of Population of the United States by Age, Color, and Sex, July 1, 1960 to 1965. Table 1, Page 11.

---

[7] Norman L. Friedman, "Comprehensiveness and Higher Education: A Sociologist's View of Public Junior College Trends," AAUP Bulletin, Winter 1966. pp. 417-423; p. 420.

Table 4 -- Enrollment by grade[1] in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools: United States, 1954-55 to 1965-66

(In thousands)

Grade	1954-55[2]	1955-56	1956-57[2]	1957-58	1958-59[2]	1959-60	1960-61[2]	1961-62	1962-63[2]	1963-64[3]	1964-65[2]	1965-66[3]
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						NUMBER						
All grades	30,045	31,163	32,334	33,529	34,839	36,087	37,260	38,253	39,746	41,025	42,280	43,023
Kindergarten-grade 8	23,471	24,290	25,016	25,669	26,581	27,602	28,439	28,686	29,374	29,915	30,652	31,162
Kindergarten	1,415	1,564	1,675	1,772	1,834	1,923	2,000	2,065	2,162	2,177	2,250	2,305
1st grade	(3,518)[4]	3,495	3,491	3,587	3,679	3,733	3,822	3,857	3,928	4,023	4,014	4,065
2nd grade	3,391	(3,242)[4]	3,241	3,214	3,346	3,436	3,502	3,568	3,630	3,706	3,800	3,789
3rd grade	2,896	3,291	(3,183)[4]	3,176	3,179	3,302	3,405	3,428	3,518	3,560	3,662	3,735
4th grade	2,535	2,848	3,238	(3,128)[4]	3,142	3,146	3,278	3,343	3,391	3,467	3,523	3,612
5th grade	2,523	2,481	2,808	3,181	(3,099)[4]	3,118	3,131	3,218	3,332	3,366	3,465	3,501
6th grade	2,584	2,470	2,443	2,759	3,136	(3,070)[4]	3,095	3,065	3,190	3,299	3,362	3,421
7th grade	2,432	2,542	2,476	2,458	2,785	3,173	(3,123)[4]	3,122	3,140	3,241	3,363	3,421
8th grade	2,177	2,357	2,460	2,395	2,381	2,701	3,083	(3,021)[4]	3,083	3,077	3,212	3,313
Grades 9-12 and postgraduate	6,574	6,873	7,318	7,860	8,258	8,485	8,821	9,566	10,372	11,110	11,628	11,860
1st year high school	2,028	2,143	2,368	2,480	2,412	2,412	2,750	3,156	(3,172)[4]	3,190	3,198	3,336
2nd year high school	1,765	1,849	1,974	2,194	2,318	2,258	2,252	2,595	2,981	(3,006)[4]	3,085	3,102
3rd year high school	1,520	1,543	1,615	1,736	1,955	2,063	1,997	2,018	2,348	2,747	(2,778)[4]	2,834
4th year high school	1,246	1,326	1,349	1,431	1,538	1,747	1,820	1,791	1,866	2,160	2,560	(2,581)[4]
Postgraduate	15	13	13	19	35	4	2	7	5	6	7	7
						PERCENT						
All grades	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Kindergarten	4.7	5.0	5.2	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.3	5.4
1st grade	11.7	11.2	10.8	10.7	10.6	10.3	10.3	10.1	9.9	9.8	9.4	9.4
2nd grade	11.3	10.4	10.0	9.6	9.6	9.5	9.4	9.3	9.1	9.0	9.0	8.8
3rd grade	9.6	10.6	9.8	9.5	9.1	9.2	9.1	9.0	8.9	8.7	8.7	8.6
4th grade	8.4	9.1	10.0	9.3	9.0	8.7	8.8	8.7	8.5	8.5	8.3	8.4
5th grade	8.4	8.0	8.7	9.5	8.9	8.6	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.1
6th grade	8.6	7.9	7.6	8.2	9.0	8.5	8.3	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
7th grade	8.1	8.2	7.7	7.3	8.0	8.8	8.4	8.2	7.9	7.9	8.0	8.0
8th grade	7.2	7.6	7.6	7.1	6.8	7.5	8.3	7.9	7.8	7.5	7.6	7.7
1st year high school	6.7	6.9	7.3	7.4	6.9	6.7	7.4	8.2	8.0	7.8	7.5	7.8
2nd year high school	5.9	5.9	6.1	6.5	6.7	6.3	6.0	6.8	7.5	7.3	7.3	7.2
3rd year high school	5.1	5.0	5.0	5.2	5.6	5.7	5.4	5.3	5.9	6.7	6.6	6.6
4th year high school	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7	5.3	6.1	6.0
Postgraduate	(5)	(5)	(5)	.1	.1	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)

[1] Enrollment in ungraded and special class is not shown separately but is prorated among the grades.

[2] Data derived from special studies or estimates.

[3] Estimated from fall data.

[4] Figures in parentheses, shown in normal progression, indicate enrollments in successive grades of the pupils who entered the 1st grade in 1954-55 including retarded and accelerated pupils. Because of retardation, school retention rates should not be calculated directly from 1st grade enrollment.

[5] Less than 0.05 percent

NOTE: Data for 1958-59 include Alaska; data for 1959-60 and subsequent years include Alaska and Hawaii. Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, "Statistics of State School Systems, 1963-64"; and Office of Education estimates.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Digest of Educational Statistics, 1966. OE-10024-66. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Table 5 -- Projections of Fall College Enrollments

Year	Number Enrolled (000's)		Percent of civilian noninstitutional population, age 18 to 21 years, enrolled in school or college as of October	
	Series 1	Series 2	1	2
1960	3,570		29.5%	29.5%
1961	3,731		...	...
1963	4,336		...	...
1965	5,675		39.6	39.6
1966	6,085		...	...
1967	6,373	6,237	...	...
1969	7,077	6,790		
1970	7,424	7,047	40.9	38.9
1971	7,820	7,353	...	...
1973	8,641	7,968	...	...
1975	9,459	8,565	44.5	40.7
1977	10,190	9,069	...	...
1979	10,887	9,534	...	...
1980	11,181	9,718	47.7	42.2

Increase.

1960 to 1965	2,105	
1965 to 1970	1,749	1,372
1970 to 1975	2,035	1,518
1975 to 1980	1,722	1,153

Series 1. The average annual percent reduction in the percent not enrolled at each age between 1950-52 (centered on 1951) and 1963-65 (centered on 1964) would apply to the period 1964 to 1985. The resulting "nonenrollment rates" were then adjusted to tie in with the survey estimates for 1965 based on the current population survey by (substituting the estimated rates for 1965 for the projected rates for that year; (2) retaining the original projected rates for 1985; and (3) reducing the difference between the projected rates and the estimated rates in 1965 linearly to zero in 1985.

Series 2. Enrollment rates at each age would be the average of the Series 1 enrollment rates and the enrollment rates of 1965.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Current Population Reports, Population Estimates, Revised Projections of School and College Enrollment in the United States to 1985. Series P-25, No. 365, May 5, 1967. Table 1, p. 4; Appendix Table A.

Table 6 -- Projections of Enrollment, Four-Year Colleges and Universities, 1965-1985

(Enrollment figures { cols. 2-5 } in thousands)

Year	Total college enroll-ment	F.T.E.[a] enroll-ment in 4-year insti-tutions	F.T.E.[a] enrollment increments Annual	F.T.E.[a] enrollment increments Biennial	F.T.E.[a] enrollment increments Quinquennial
1	2	3	4	5	6
1965-66	5,570	3,988	457	...	
1966-67	6,007	4,230	242	699	
1967-68	6,538	4,589	359	601	
1968-69	7,097	4,967	378	737	
1969-70	7,263	5,074	107	485	
1970-71	7,583	5,285	211	318	1,297
1971-72	7,905	5,489	204	415	
1972-73	8,304	5,743	254	458	
1973-74	8,728	6,015	272	526	
1974-75	9,116	6,262	257	529	
1975-76	9,556	6,543	281	538	1,258
1976-77	9,830	6,704	161	442	
1977-78	10,121	6,877	173	334	
1978-79	10,388	7,027	150	323	
1979-80	10,670	7,187	160	310	
1980-81	10,900	7,312	125	285	769
1981-82	11,047	7,377	65	190	
1982-83	11,229	7,464	87	152	
1983-84	11,330	7,495	31	118	
1984-85	11,522	7,584	89	110	
1985-86	11,820	7,737	153	242	425

Sources:
Col. 2: The 1965-66 total college enrollment figure is from Opening (Fall) Enrollment in Higher Education, 1965, OE-54003-65 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966). The enrollment projections are based on Series IV of Allan M. Cartter and Robert Farrell, "Higher Education in the Last Third of the Century," Educational Record, Spring 1965, pp. 121-24.

Adapted from:
Allan M. Cartter, "Future Faculty: Needs and Resources,"in Improving College Teaching, Calvin B.T. Lee, Editor. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967. Pages 113-135. Table above from page 135.

[a] The part-time, full-time student mix is assumed to remain stable over the period covered (part-time equals approximately 29% of total enrollment). Full-time equivalents (f.t.e.) are derived by adding 40% of part-time students to full-time enrollment estimates. Junior college enrollments are excluded.

Table 7 -- Total opening fall degree-credit and estimated nondegree-credit enrollment in all institutions of higher education

Year (Fall)	Total degree-credit enrollment	Degree-credit enrollment in		Percent of degree credit enrollment in 4-year institutions	Non-degree credit enrollment	Percent of degree credit enrollment represented by non-degree credit
		4-year	2-year			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1957	3,047,373	2,678,211	369,162	87.9	176,000	5.8%
1959	3,377,273	2,967,558	409,715	87.9	194,000	5.7
1961	3,860,643	3,342,718	517,925	86.6	187,000	4.8
1963	4,494,626	3,869,837	624,789	86.1	271,241	6.0
1965	5,526,325	4,684,888	841,437	84.8	394,539	7.1
1966 (projected)	6,055,000	5,121,000	934,000	84.6	434,000	7.2
1967 (projected)	6,541,000	5,518,000	1,023,000	84.4	471,000	7.2
1969 (projected)	7,050,000	5,923,000	1,127,000	84.0	513,000	7.3
1971 (projected)	7,604,000	6,362,000	1,242,000	83.7	558,000	7.3
1973 (projected)	8,335,000	6,949,000	1,386,000	83.4	617,000	7.4
1975 (projected)	8,995,000	7,474,000	1,521,000	83.1	670,000	7.4
Increase						
1959 to 1967	3,163,727	2,550,442	613,285	80.6	277,000	8.8
1967 to 1975	2,454,000	1,956,000	498,000	79.7	199,000	8.1

Source: U. S. Office of Education, Projections of Educational Statistics to 1975-76 (1966 Edition). (Tables 4, 5, 6, and 14).

Table 8 -- Total opening fall degree-credit enrollment in 4-year institutions and 2-year institutions of higher education

					Percent of total enrollment in public institutions	
	4-year		2-year			
Fall	Public	Private	Public	Private	4-year	2-year
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1957	1,446,736	1,231,475	315,900	53,172	47.5	10.4
1959	1,628,055	1,339,503	355,967	53,748	48.2	10.5
1961	1,872,531	1,470,187	456,381	61,544	48.5	11.8
1963	2,297,146	1,572,691	551,308	73,481	51.1	12.3
1965	2,886,552	1,798,336	737,890	103,547	52.2	13.4
1967[a]	3,461,000	2,057,000	900,000	123,000	52.9	13.8
1969[a]	3,777,000	2,146,000	995,000	132,000	53.6	14.1
1971[a]	4,114,000	2,248,000	1,099,000	142,000	54.1	14.5
1973[a]	4,557,000	2,392,000	1,230,000	156,000	54.7	14.8
1975[a]	4,962,000	2,512,000	1,353,000	168,000	55.2	15.0
Increase from						
1959 to 1967-	1,832,945	717,497	544,033	69,252		
1967 to 1975-	1,501,000	455,000	453,000	45,000		

[a] Projected

Source: U. S. Office of Education, Projections of Educational Statistics to 1975-76. Tables 5 and 6.

Table 9 -- Full-time instructional staff, instructor or above, and total instructional staff, for resident degree-credit courses in institutions of higher education: United States and outlying areas, 1st term, 1957-58 to 1975-75, biennially.

Session	Full-time Instructional Staff, Instructor or above			Total Instructional Staff[a]		
		Two-year increase			Two-year increase	
	Number	Number	Percent	Number	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1957-58	154,602	...	...	260,486	...	...
1959-60	163,656	9,054	5.9%	283,080	22,594	8.7%
1961-62	178,632	14,976	9.2	312,687	29,607	10.5
1963-64	204,561	25,929	14.5	358,153	45,466	14.5
(est.) 1965-66	245,000	40,439	19.8	432,000	73,847	20.6
(projected) 1967-68	283,000	38,000	15.5	499,000	67,000	15.5
1969-70	301,000	18,000	6.4	530,000	31,000	6.2
1971-72	320,000	19,000	6.3	563,000	33,000	6.2
1973-74	345,000	25,000	7.8	607,000	44,000	7.8
1975-76	367,000	22,000	6.4	646,000	39,000	6.4
1976-77	376,000	...	...	...	...	...

Increase between		
1959 and 1967	119,344 (72.9%)	215,920 (76.3%)
Increase between 1967 and 1975	84,000 (29.7%)	147,000 (29.5%)

Source: U. S. Office of Education. Projections of Educational Statistics to 1975-76. Table 27 up-dated for 1967 edition). Washington, D.C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

[a] Includes full-time and part-time faculty, instructor and above, and junior instructional staff.

Table 10 -- Total demand for estimated full-time equivalent instructional staff in institutions of higher education: United States and outlying areas, 1st term, 1961-62 to 1976-77 1/ 2/

Year (fall)	Full-time equivalents employed 3/			Additional full-time equivalents		
	Total	Instructional staff		Total	For increased enrollment	For replacement
		For resident degree credit courses	Other instructional staff			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1961-62	264,000	223,000	41,000	-	-	-
1962-63 4/	282,000	239,000	43,000	34,000	18,000	16,000
1963-64	302,000	254,000	48,000	37,000	20,000	17,000
1964-65 4/	324,000	276,000	48,000	40,000	22,000	18,000
1965-66 5/	359,000	306,000	53,000	54,000	35,000	19,000
1966-67 5/	385,000	328,000	57,000	48,000	26,000	22,000
1962-67	-	-	-	213,000	121,000	92,000
			Projected 6/			
1967-68	416,000	355,000	61,000	54,000	31,000	23,000
1968-69	438,000	373,000	65,000	47,000	22,000	25,000
1969-70	441,000	376,000	65,000	29,000	3,000	26,000
1970-71	453,000	386,000	67,000	38,000	12,000	26,000
1971-72	469,000	400,000	69,000	43,000	16,000	27,000
1967-72	-	-	-	211,000	84,000	127,000
1972-73	487,000	415,000	72,000	46,000	18,000	28,000
1973-74	506,000	431,000	75,000	48,000	19,000	29,000
1974-75	522,000	445,000	77,000	46,000	16,000	30,000
1975-76	539,000	459,000	80,000	48,000	17,000	31,000
1976-77	553,000	471,000	82,000	46,000	14,000	32,000
1972-77	-	-	-	234,000	84,000	150,000

Kenneth A. Simon and Marie G. Fullam. Projections of Educational Statistics to 1975-76 (data up-dated for 1967 edition). Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Footnotes to Table 10

1/ Sources: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education publications: (1) "Faculty in Institutions of Higher Education, November 1955"; and (2) "Faculty and Other Professional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education", biennially, 1st term, 1957-58 through 1st term, 1963-64.

2/ For the categories of professional staff members included in this table, see footnotes 2 through 6, table 29.

3/ For method of estimating and projecting full-time equivalents, see table 28, footnote 4 and table 30, footnotes 3 and 6.

4/ Interpolated.

5/ Estimated.

6/ The projection of additional full-time equivalent instructional staff for increased enrollment was computed as the difference between the total full-time equivalents employed in 2 successive years.

The projection of additional full-time equivalent instructional staff for replacement of those leaving the profession, temporarily or permanently, was estimated at 6 percent of the total full-time equivalents employed in the previous year.

Table 11 -- Number and percent of full-time professional staff, October 1963; estimated additional number needed, exclusive of replacements, November 1963 - October 1969, in higher education (universities, colleges, junior colleges, technical institutes, etc.)

Field	Percent of professional staff, 1963	Number employed 1963-64	Number added between 1963 and 1969	Number employed 1969-70	Percent of increase 1963 to 1969
1	2	3	4	5	6
Total all fields	100.0	264,613	147,700	412,313	55.8
Administrative					
Total	18.8	49,815	23,789	73,604	47.8
General	4.6	12,209	5,387	17,596	44.1
Academic affairs	5.2	13,770	6,421	20,191	46.6
Student services	4.7	12,560	6,879	19,439	54.8
Business affairs	4.2	11,076	5,102	16,178	46.1
Academic					
Total	79.0	209,060	117,823	326,883	56.4
Agriculture & Forestry	2.9	7,631	1,665	9,296	21.8
Biological sciences	6.4	16,885	9,083	25,968	53.8
Business and commerce	4.0	10,503	6,792	17,295	64.7
Education	10.6	28,164	14,458	42,622	51.3
Engineering (including architecture)	5.7	15,208	6,492	21,700	42.7
English and journalism	6.6	17,518	11,665	29,183	66.6
Fine and applied arts	6.3	16,713	9,819	26,532	58.8
Foreign languages	4.3	11,304	7,475	18,779	66.1
Geography	.6	1,508	1,246	2,754	82.6
Health professions	6.4	16,982	6,955	23,937	41.0
Home economics	1.1	2,836	1,192	4,028	42.0
Law	.6	1,485	585	2,070	39.4
Library sciences	.2	595	544	1,139	91.4
Mathematical subjects	3.8	10,013	6.977	16,990	69.7
Philosophy	1.2	3,239	2,000	5,239	61.7
Physical sciences	6.7	17,840	10,402	28,242	58.3
Psychology	2.1	5,476	4,146	9,622	75.7
Religion	1.1	2,911	1,166	4,077	40.1
Basic social sciences	7.6	20,082	13,744	33,826	68.4
Applied social sciences	.5	1,443	870	2,313	60.3
All other	.3	724	547	1,271	75.6
Technical and semi-professional					
Total	2.2	5,738	6,088	11,826	106.1

Table 11 -- continued

Field	Percent of professional staff, 1963	Number employed 1963-64	Number added between 1963 and 1969	Number employed 1969-70	Percent of increase 1963 to 1969
1	2	3	4	5	6
Engineering-related	.8	2,037	2,733	4,770	134.2
Nonengineering-related	1.4	3,701	3,355	7,056	90.7
Academic, technical and semiprofessional					
Total	81.2	214,798	123,911	338,709	57.7

Source: James F. Rogers, Staffing American Colleges and Universities. Washington: U.S. Office of Education (OE-53028) 1967. p. 14.

Table 12 -- Distribution of AAUP members and teaching faculty, and estimated percent of teaching faculty represented by AAUP membership, 1963

Field 1	Percentage of AAUP membership 2	Percentage of faculty in teaching area 3	Estimated percent of full-time faculty represented by AAUP membership[a/] 4
Arts and sciences (Total)	70.1%	60.8%	30.0%
Humanities	29.5	23.7	32.4
Social sciences	21.0	15.3	35.7
Natural sciences and math	19.6	22.0	23.2
Professions, etc. (Total)	29.9	39.2	19.8
Education and physical education	9.1	12.4	19.1
Business	3.9	5.0	20.3
Engineering	3.1	6.9	11.7
Health professions	4.3	4.7	23.8
Others (agriculture, home economics, law, library science, etc.	10.2	10.0	26.5

---

a/ Membership of AAUP on January 1, 1963, was distributed by percentages noted in Column 2. Total full-time faculty for degree-credit instruction in 1963 as estimated by James Rogers (Staffing American Colleges and Universities) at 209,060 was distributed by percentages listed in Column 3.

Source: Columns 2 and 3, AAUP, "Part 1, Systematic Examination of the Current Structure and Functioning of the Association," AAUP Bulletin, May 1965. p. 112.

Table 13 -- Teaching faculty in universities and 4-year colleges by principal teaching area and selected institutional attributes: Aggregate United States, spring 1963

Teaching Faculty	Percent of Faculty		Selected Institutional Attributes																			
			Universities										Colleges and technological institutions									
			Total		Control				Size													
					Public		Private		750 faculty or more		Under 750 faculty											
	Univer-sities	Colleges & Tech. Instit.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.										
Total.			68,925	100	44,923	65	24,002	35	28,983	42	39,942	58	69,278	100	33,465	48	35,813	52	16,882	24	52,396	76
Principal teaching area:																						
Agriculture and related fields. .	85.6	14.4	2,556	100	2,491	97	65	3	1,093	43	1,463	57	430	100	409	95	21	5	146	34	284	66
Biological sciences	62.0	38.0	6,758	100	4,229	63	2,529	37	3,260	48	3,499	52	4,134	100	1,952	47	2,182	53	873	21	3,261	79
Business and commerce	50.9	49.1	3,553	100	2,321	65	1,232	35	1,389	39	2,164	61	3,421	100	1,961	57	1,460	43	998	29	2,424	71
Education and related fields. . .	36.8	63.2	3,939	100	2,926	74	1,014	26	1,610	41	2,330	59	6,777	100	4,703	69	2,074	31	1,629	24	5,148	76
Engineering	67.1	32.9	6,372	100	4,770	75	1,602	25	2,974	47	3,399	53	3,125	100	1,567	50	1,558	50	1,890	60	1,235	40
English and journalism.	39.1	60.9	4,611	100	3,085	67	1,526	33	1,556	34	3,055	66	7,187	100	3,332	46	3,855	54	1,375	19	5,812	81
Fine arts	36.5	63.5	4,882	100	3,509	72	1,373	28	1,939	40	2,944	60	8,479	100	3,936	46	4,543	54	1,598	19	6,881	81
Foreign languages and literature.	46.3	53.7	3,478	100	1,908	55	1,570	45	1,393	40	2,085	60	4,037	100	953	24	3,083		705	17	3,332	83
Health fields	88.3	11.7	6,626	100	3,127	47	3,499	53	2,965	45	3,661	55	876	100	347	40	529	60	338	39	538	61
Home economics.	48.0	52.0	935	100	848	91	87	9	393	42	542	58	1,011	100	651	64	360	36	262	26	749	74
Law	87.0	13.0	1,268	100	657	52	610	48	503	40	765	60	190	100	63	33	127	67	53	28	137	72
Mathematics	42.5	57.5	3,244	100	2,088	64	1,155	36	1,304	40	1,940	60	4,396	100	2,323	53	2,074	47	1,225	28	3,171	72
Philosophy.	42.2	57.8	935	100	477	51	458	49	331	35	604	65	1,279	100	283	22	996	78	200	16	1,079	84
Physical and health education . .	33.1	66.9	2,079	100	1,632	79	447	21	808	39	1,271	61	4,201	100	2,559	61	1,642	39	923	22	3,278	78
Physical sciences	47.5	52.5	5,617	100	3,731	66	1,886	34	2,491	44	3,126	56	6,212	100	2,510	40	3,702	60	1,532	25	4,680	75
Psychology.	50.4	49.6	1,939	100	1,208	62	730	38	908	47	1,031	53	1,910	100	766	40	1,144	60	558	29	1,352	71
Religion and theology	32.4	67.6	697	100	21	3	676	97	98	14	599	86	1,451	100	53	4	1,399	96	95	7	1,356	93
Social sciences	47.2	52.8	8,024	100	4,961	62	3,063	38	3,414	43	4,609	57	8,960	100	4,193	47	4,767	53	1,942	22	7,018	78
All other fields.	54.0	46.0	1,412	100	933	66	480	34	556	39	856	61	1,202	100	906	75	296	25	541	45	661	55

Ralph E. Dunham, Patricia S. Wright, Marjorie O. Chandler, Teaching Faculty in Universities and Four-Year Colleges, Spring, 1963. Washington: U. S. Office of Education, (OE-53022-63) 1966. Pages 64 and 65.

Table 14 -- Faculty in universities and 4-year colleges distributed by principal teaching area, by type of institution

Principal Teaching Area	Universities				Colleges & Technological Institutions				Total teaching faculty
	Control		Faculty size		Control		Faculty size		
	Public	Private	750 or more	Under 750	Public	Private	200 or more	Under 200	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Agriculture & Rel.	6%	0%	4%	4%	1%	0%	1%	1%	2%
Biological sciences	9	11	11	9	6	6	5	6	8
Business & commerce	5	5	5	5	6	4	6	5	5
Education & Rel.	7	4	6	6	14	6	10	10	8
Engineering	11	7	10	9	5	4	11	2	7
English & Journ.	7	6	5	8	10	11	8	11	9
Fine arts	8	6	7	7	12	13	9	13	10
Foreign Language & Literature	4	7	5	5	3	9	4	6	5
Health fields	7	15	10	9	1	1	2	1	5
Home economics	2	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1
Law	1	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	1
Mathematics	5	5	4	5	7	6	7	6	6
Philosophy	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	2	2
Phys. & Health education	4	2	3	3	8	5	5	6	5
Physical sciences	8	8	9	8	8	10	9	9	9
Psychology	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3
Religion & theology	0	3	0	2	0	4	1	3	2
Social sciences	11	13	12	12	13	13	12	13	12
All other fields	2	2	2	2	3	1	3	1	2
Totals	101	102	101	102	102	100	99	99	102

Ralph E. Dunham, Patricia S. Wright, Marjorie O. Chandler, Teaching Faculty in Universities and Four-Year Colleges, Spring, 1963. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, (OE-53022-63) 1966. Pages 62-64.

Table 15 -- AAUP Membership Compared with Full-Time Instructional Staff for Residential Instruction in Degree Credit Courses, and Estimated AAHE Membership, 1949-50 to 1966-67

Academic year	Full-time staff, instructor or above	AAUP membership Jan. 1 of the relevant academic year	No. of AAUP members per 100 full-time staff, instructor or above	Estimated AAHE membership
1949-50	113,689[a]	37,524	33.0	18,524
1951-52	109,787[a]	42,263	38.4	16,000
1953-54	123,877[a]	43,525	35.1	16,000
1955-56	135,390[a]	37,567	27.7	17,000
1957-58	154,602	37,363	24.2	15,000
1959-60	163,656	39,020	23.8	16,000
1960-61	170,000[b]	42,273	24.9	16,000
1961-62	178,632	49,022	27.4	17,500
1962-63	192,000[b]	54,387	28.3	18,500
1963-64	204,561	61,316	30.0	20,075
1964-65	221,000[b]	66,645	30.2	22,309
1965-66	245,000[c]	74,962	30.6	22,300
1966-67	262,000[c]	80,142	30.6	24,000
1967-68	283,000[c]	87,754[d]	31.0	

---

[a] Estimated on the assumption that full-time staff, instructor or above, was the same percentage of all instructional staff as in 1957-58.

[b] Interpolated

[c] Estimated

AAHE Membership listed is that reported in the NEA Handbook for the subsequent session.

Staff data from U. S. Office of Education, Projections of Educational Statistics, to 1975-76 (1966 Edition) Table 27 corrected for 1967 edition.

[d] If some 2,300 applications for membership are included the membership is approximately 90,000 as of January 1, 1968.

Table 16 -- Membership, Total Expenditure, and Expenditures per Member of AAUP and AAHE, 1961-62 through 1966-67

Year	AAUP			AAHE		
	Number of members	Expenditures	Amount per member	Number of members	Expenditures	Amount per member
1961-62	49,022	$442,333	$9.02	17,500	$160,712	$9.18
1962-63	54,387	503,897	9.27	18,500	212,498	11.49
1963-64	6.316	562,787	9.18	20,075	176,041	8.77
1964-65	66,645	643,767	9.66	22,309	178,000	7.98
1965-66	74,962	759,666	10.11	22,300	183,888	8.25
1966-67	80,142	1,000,104(b)	(12.48)	24,000	193,400(b)	(8.06)

(b) - budgeted

AAUP information is for calendar year corresponding to second half of academic year. AAUP expenditure information is listed with budget for each year.

AAHE information on membership is the number reported in the handbook for the following session. AAHE information on expenditures includes only the amount reported as being expended by AAHE in the report of the budget committee of the NEA.

V. ACTIVITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION REPORTED BY STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS, 1967-68[1]

To provide information for the NEA Task Force on Higher Education, the NEA Research Division prepared a questionnaire which was sent to state education associations early in February by the office of the Executive Secretary of the National Council of State Education Associations. The questionnaire reviewed the levels of priority and the type of program which the state education associations intend to provide for personnel in institutions of higher education. In addition to selected characteristics of their existing programs, information was requested about their most attractive services and major problems in higher education.

To identify the type of program which the state education associations intend to provide for persons employed in institutions of higher education, the respondents were asked to indicate which of four levels of involvement most nearly describes the association objectives for professional personnel in different types of institutions. Also, the respondents were asked to indicate which of four categories of increasing specificity characterize the program of services to higher education being prescribed by the state education association. These items of information were considered to be needed from all state associations and a special effort was made to elicit their response to this portion of the survey instrument.

The completed questionnaire was received from 37 state education associations in 36 states by April 11, 1968. The remaining 20 state education associations were contacted by telephone or by special request for basic information.

To facilitate analysis of their responses, the state education association reports were divided into four groups on the basis of the comprehensiveness of the association policy for involvement in higher education. The numbers of a associations in each group which reported each level of involvement in higher education are shown in Table 17. The associations placed in sub-group A-special were selected for special study prior to the distribution of the questionnaire; they were known to have active programs in higher education. However, one of the state associations pre-selected for placement in this subgroup reported that its objectives are not directed to as close involvement in higher education as that reported by many of the other state associations; therefore it was regrouped.

The associations in Group A report that they assign high priority to serving the needs and interests of personnel in higher education, particularly in public institutions, and they also have programs with specific objectives directed to serving personnel at this level of the profession. The association in Group B report that they give some attention to the needs of personnel in higher education but that higher education constitutes a small group to be served in much the same manner as other small groups within the profession.

---

[1] This section of the report was prepared for the Task Force by William S. Graybeal of The Research Division, NEA.

TABLE 17 -- Policy and Program for Higher Education Reported by 48 State Education Associations

Policy and segment of higher education affected	Number of state education associations					
	A		Group B	Group C	Group D	Total
	Special	Other				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extent of association involvement						
1. Serving the needs and interests of this segment is an interval part of the Association program; it is one of the primary sectors of the profession to be served.						
Public 4-year institutions	6	11	0	0	5	22
Public 2-year institutions	6	10	1	0	4	21
Non-public institutions.	2	7	0	0	2	11
2. This segment of higher education constitutes a small group to be served in the same manner as other small segments or departments within the profession.						
Public 4-year institutions	0	0	12	1	3	16
Public 2-year institutions	0	1	11	0	4	16
Non-public institutions.	3	1	10	0	4	18
3. This segment of higher education receives attention only where its needs overlap those being advanced by the Association at the elementary- and secondary-school level.						
Public 4-year institutions.	0	0	1	4	3	8
Public 2-year institutions.	0	0	0	4	2	6
Non-public institutions.	1	1	1	3	5	11
4. The Association has no policy about services to this segment of higher education.						
Public 4-year institutions.	0	0	0	2	0	2
Public 2-year institutions.	0	0	1	3	0	4
Non-public institutions.	0	1	2	3	0	6

TABLE 17 -- Policy and Program for Higher Education Reported by 48 State Education Associations (Continued)

Policy and segment of higher education affected	Number of state education associations					
	A		Group B	Group C	Group D	Total
	Special	Other				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Type of program						
1. Few, if any services: This Association does not attempt to serve the interests and needs of higher education.	0	0	0	2	0	2
2. Incidental services: Association activities in higher education are largely extensions of, or are incidentally related to, its activities directed to other groups in the profession	0	1	7	5	3	16
3. General services: Association activities in higher education are largely statements of support or endorsement of the goals and objectives advanced by other groups involved more intimately with the advancement of higher education.	0	3	6	0	5	14
4. Active services: Association activities are identifiable as specific programs for establishing and accomplishing definite objectives related to needs and interests in higher education. . . .	6	7	0	0	3	16
Number of state education associations.	6	11	13	7	11	48

Note: Nine state education associations did not respond by April 16, 1968.

2✓

Also, the program of services of these associations are either very general or incidental extensions of their services to persons employed at other levels of the profession.

The association in Group C have either no policy or have a policy of serving the interests and needs of personnel in higher education only where these overlap the association activities for persons at the elementary and secondary school level. Also, they either have no programs or their programs to serve persons in higher education are only incidental extensions of their activities directed to personnel at other levels of education.

The associations listed in Group D of Table 17 did not respond to the questionnaire, or their response was received too late to be included in this summary. As a result of a special request, several of the nonresponding associations which are listed in Group D reported their policy regarding higher education. These state education associations are not included in the remainder of this summary. The state education associations in each group are listed in Table 23.

The information in Table 17 shows that slightly less than half of the state education associations have an objective or policy for the most extensive level of involvement in the interests and concerns of professional personnel in higher education. Only one-third of the associations report having an objective of having the most active type of program directed to accomplishing specific objectives related to the interests and needs of personnel employed in higher education.

However, as a whole, the state associations are not disregarding the interests and needs of persons employed in higher education. Only six associations report that they have no policy about serving persons in higher education, and only two report they do not attempt to serve the interests and needs of professional personnel in higher education.

The extent of association involvement being attempted tends to be more comprehensive or active for personnel in the public institutions than in the nonpublic ones; again, however, only a few of the state associations report having no policy about providing services to personnel in the nonpublic segment of higher education.

The information in columns 2 and 3 of Table 17 shows that the 17 state education associations having the objective of providing an active program for serving higher education as a primary sector of the profession, Group A, represent less than half of the 37 associations which returned the complete questionnaire. If the state associations which responded to only the first portion of the questionnaire are included, Group A would be enlarged by four associations and would represent about three-sevenths of all associations which responded to this section of the questionnaire.

At the other extreme the seven state education associations placed in Group C, having little or no involvement in higher education, represent less than one-fifth of the 37 state education associations which returned the completed questionnaire. If the associations which responded to only the first section of the questionnaire are included, the number which would need to be classified in Group C would be increased by three, and this number would continue to represent about one-fifth of all responding state education associations.

The information in Table 18 shows that the six states having the state education associations in sub-group A-Special enroll almost one-third of all students in higher education and contain about one-fourth of all institutions of higher education. These states contain a higher proportion of the public 2-year institutions than of the other types.

The states in which the associations of Group A are located enroll almost half of the students in higher education and have more than two-fifths of the institutions. The states in which the associations in Groups B and C combined are located enroll about one-sixth of the students in higher education and contain about one-fifth of the institutions. The states in which the nonresponding associations are located, Group D and others, enroll about one-third of the students in higher education and have more than one-third of the institutions.

The summary in Table 19 provides an overview of the scope of programs and extent of membership potential being enrolled by the 37 state education associations which responded to the questionnaire. As shown in the second line, about three-fourths of these state associations have a division or unit consisting of professional personnel employed in institutions of higher education. The presence of such units is reported by all of the associations in sub-group A-Special, but the proportion of associations having this organization drops slightly in sub-group A-Other and Group B. The group of state education associations reporting an objective of least involvement with higher education (Group C) has the lowest proportion which report having a department or division consisting of personnel employed in higher education.

The presence of professional staff members employed full time for services to higher education is reported by five of the six state education associations preselected for their known involvement with higher education (sub-group A-Special); only two of the other reporting state education associations report having one or more such persons employed full time. Among the 37 state associations only seven report having one or more staff working full time in higher education.

The proportion of higher education institutions in which the state education associations report having members enrolled varies widely but tends to be near 100.0 percent among the 30 to 33 states reporting this information. The percents of institutions where members are employed ranges from 26.6 percent to 100.0 percent among the 4-year institutions; and from zero to 100.0 percent among the 2-year institutions. The groups of state education associations do not differ widely in this characteristic.

The percents of all faculty reported to be members of the state education associations vary widely and only slightly more than half of the associations report data for both factors needed to calculate these percentages. The level of success in enrolling persons employed in higher education in the groups of reporting associations does not follow a pattern.

TABLE 18 -- Selected Characteristics of Higher Education in States Grouped by the Extent of State Education Association Involvement Planned in Higher Education

Item	States which contain associations in groups					
	A		B	C	D	Total
	Special	Other				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of states.	6	11	12	7	14	50
Percent of fall 1967-68 enrollment in higher education.	32.5%	16.9%	13.9%	3.3%	33.5%	100.1%
Percent of institutions of higher education in 1966-67	26.2	18.6	16.3	3.0	36.0	100.1
Public.	24.8	18.9	17.6	4.1	34.6	100.0
4-year	17.8	23.1	18.8	5.0	35.2	99.9
2-year	31.6	14.7	16.4	3.2	34.1	100.0
Private	27.0	18.4	15.5	2.4	36.7	100.0

Source:

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Education Directory, 1966-1967, Part 3, Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967. 252 p.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1967. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967. 136 p.

TABLE 19 -- Selected Characteristics of Activities of State Education Associations in Higher Education

Item		Group of state education associations				
		A		B	C	Total
		Special	Other			
1		2	3	4	5	6
1. Number of associations responding . . .		6	11	13	7	37
2. Number of associations having a department, division, or unit consisting of professional personnel employed in higher education.		6	9	12	2	29
3. Number of associations having one or more full-time staff working for higher education		5	1	1	0	7
4. Percent of higher education institutions in which association members are employed						
4-year institutions	Low	48.7%	80.4%	26.6%	71.4%	
	Median.	67.1	96.4	100.0	100.0	
	High.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Number of states reporting . . .	6	8	12	7	33
2-year institutions	Low	16.6%	42.8%	50.0%	0.0%	
	Median.	91.5	83.3	100.0	100.0	
	High.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Number of states reporting. . .	6	7	10	7	30
5. Percent of faculty and staff in higher education institutions who are members of the state education association						
4-year institutions	Low	2.4%	7.3%	9.5%	2.5%	
	Median.	10.0	...	21.8	6.9	
	High	20.0	22.8	59.1	9.7	
	Number of states reporting . . .	5	3	7	5	20
2-year institutions	Low	10.0%	25.2%	6.8%	0.0%	
	Median.	20.0	...	31.7	12.2	
	High.	65.0	100.0	99.2	58.4	
	Number of states reporting . . .	5	4	8	6	23

TABLE 19 -- Selected Characteristics of Activities of State Education Associations in Higher Education (Continued

Item	Group of state education associations				
	A		B	C	Total
	Special	Other			
1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Number of faculty and staff in higher education institutions who are members of the state education association					
4-year institutions (Low	400	80	50	18	
(Median.	1,000	490	354	91	
(High.	2,000	800	1,846	938	
(Number of states (reporting	5	9	10	6	30
(Average	1,126	446	486	220	528
2-year institutions (Low	100	43	10	0	
(Median.	476	118	28	4	
(High.	6,500	912	427	135	
(Number of states (reporting	5	8	9	6	28
(Average	1,555	246	141	40	402
7. Number of states reporting of future staff and membership goal among persons in higher education					
4-year institutions	3	3	4	1	11
2-year institutions	3	3	3	1	10
8. Number of state education association activities reported to be practiced[a]					
Low	14	2	0	0	
Median.	17	13	10	6	
High.	22	22	16	10	

---

[a] Activities identified in earlier studies as being effective ways state education associations may serve personnel in higher education.

The number of persons in higher education who are enrolled as members of the associations, shown in item 6 of Table 19, generally follow a pattern consistent with the extent of state education association involvement in higher education. The 30 state associations reporting their membership information for 4-year institutions have 15,825 persons enrolled. The 28 state associations which report the number of their members in 2-year institutions enrolled 11,243 persons employed at this level.

The state associations were asked to report both the number of faculty and their estimate of membership among higher education faculty next year and five years from now. Only 11 of the associations reported their estimates of the information needed to calculate the percentage of higher education faculty they expect to enroll as members in the future. As in other characteristics, the response rate was highest among the education associations in sub-group A-Special. Because the number reporting represents half or fewer of the state education associations in each grouping, no further analysis is made of the reports of membership potential.

State education associations have reported in earlier surveys a variety of practices which they consider to be valuable ways of serving persons employed in higher education. For the present study these activities were grouped by several major objectives and the state associations were asked to indicate whether a practice is being used in their program, and also to report their evaluation of the potential effectiveness of the activity in serving the interests and needs of persons employed in higher education. Item 8 in Table 19 shows the number of these activities practiced by the state education associations in each grouping, and Table 20 shows the responses to each questionnaire item. While the range in the number of activities overlaps, the median numbers in Table 19 follow a pattern consistent with the level of involvement of the groups of state education associations in serving the interests and needs of higher education.

Specific Activities

Listed in Table 20 are the numbers of state education associations in each group which reported use of each of the activities identified in the questionnaire. The practices which are reported most widely and which the largest numbers of respondents indicate as being very effective are as follows:

- Actively support and publicly advance the interests of higher education as a whole in the state by giving publicity about needs and problems in higher education.
- Assist the state-supported institutions in their legislative goals by meeting with the legislators, providing research information, and publicity.
- Assist faculty in their efforts to improve retirement benefits, and salary and economic status.

TABLE 20 -- Activities Practiced by State Education Associations and the Evaluation of their Potential Effectiveness in Serving the Interests and Needs of Persons in Higher Education

Activity	Number of state associations practicing, by group					Number indicating the activity is potentially		
	A							
	Special	Other	B	C	Total	Very effective	Moderately effective	Not effective
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Actively support and publicly advance the interests of higher education as a whole in the state.								
a. Publicity about needs and problems in higher education.	6	10	8	5	29	8	20	...
b. Providing resource persons for consultation and/or broadcasting these interests. . .	4	9	6	3	22	2	16	2
2. Promote unity, professional growth, communication, and rapport in higher education as a whole by:								
a. Establishing committees to review problems common to higher education institutions and their faculties	6	4	8	1	19	2	11	4
b. Establishing the means by which continuous information from various campuses and professional societies is brought together for publication or review.	3	2	1	...	6	2	2	1
c. Providing communications media which operate within the profession at the higher education level	6	1	3	...	10	4	3	2
d. Sponsoring a state-wide event similar to the AAHE national meeting	4	5	7	...	16	7	6	3
e. Providing recognition of persons who show excellence or creativity in their approach to the objectives or problems of higher education.	3	4	4	...	11	2	7	1
f. Periodically distributing to faculty the lists of publications and information available to them from the state and national Associations	4	8	2	2	16	1	11	4

TABLE 20 -- Activities Practiced by State Education Associations and the Evaluation of their Potential Effectiveness in Serving the Interests and Needs of Persons in Higher Education

Activity	Number of state associations practicing, by group					Number indicating the activity is potentially		
	A							
	Special	Other	B	C	Total	Very effective	Moderately effective	Not effective
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
g. Contracting studies of higher education problems to faculty personnel in appropriate disciplines	...	1	1	...	2	...	1	1
3. Assist the state-supported institutions in their legislative goals by:								
a. Research information	5	8	8	1	22	6	11	2
b. Publicity	6	9	8	4	27	4	19	2
c. Dissemination of supporting information	5	7	8	3	23	5	14	2
d. Enlisting support of local associations of elementary- and secondary-school personnel	4	7	7	2	20	2	15	1
e. Meeting with legislators	6	8	7	4	25	9	14	0
4. Assist faculty in state-supported institutions to improve their working conditions and welfare by:								
a. Provision of research information	4	8	6	2	20	3	15	1
b. Public endorsement of goals	5	10	6	2	23	4	15	2
c. Providing widespread publicity	3	7	3	...	13	4	8	1
d. Meeting with legislators	6	8	5	2	21	7	13	0
e. Developing professional negotiation agreements	4	2	1	...	7	2	4	1
5. Assist faculty in their efforts to improve:								
a. Salary and economic status	6	8	9	2	25	5	18	1
b. Academic freedom and/or tenure	4	5	4	...	13	6	5	1
c. Teaching effectiveness	2	3	2	1	8	1	6	0
d. Retirement benefits	6	9	7	1	23	9	12	2
Number of state associations	6	11	13	7	37			

None of the activities were rated as very effective by more than one-fourth of the respondents. At the other extreme, few of the associations report that they are practicing activities which they rate as being not effective.

In addition to the activities listed in Table 20, the 37 state education associations were asked about the presence of committees which involve persons from the association and from higher education, the numbers and types of association publications directed to the interests and needs of persons in higher education, and whether or not the association has participated in situations involving academic freedom and professional negotiation in higher education. Twelve of the associations report presence of one or more committees involving persons from the association professional staff and members in 4-year institutions, 13 reported such committees involving persons in 2-year institutions, and 26 reported one or more committees which involve persons from both 2-year and 4-year institutions. The number of different types of publications prepared and issued by the associations in the past year which were directed specifically to higher education needs, interests, events, and/or concerns range from none to eight with 27 of the associations reporting one or more of these types of publications. Seven of the state education associations report having participated in negotiation in one or more institutions of higher education in the past year; four of these are among the six state education associations in sub-group A-Special. Twelve of the state education associations report their professional staff participated in the defense of academic freedom or defended a faculty member at one or more institutions of higher education; five of these are among the six associations in sub-group A-Special.

Services Most Attractive

The state education associations were asked to list the services which are most attractive to members in higher education. Table 21 shows the number of state association responses in each major grouping.

Among the 31 state education associations which reported one or more types of services as being most attractive to members in higher education, the specific services listed most frequently are insurance coverage, listed by 17 associations, and legislation, listed by 12 associations. The pattern of responses shows services in all three groupings are reported widely by the associations in Group A, while the responses relating to economic interests are most widely considered the most attractive services of the state associations having lesser involvement in higher education.

Problems in Higher Education

The state education associations were asked to list the major problems(s) in higher education confronting the state association. Table 22 shows the number of state education association responses in each major grouping.

The problem area most frequently reported by the 33 state education associations relates to the diversity of higher education with the many varied interests and organizations already operative at this level. This problem is reported by a large proportion of state education associations in each of the groupings.

TABLE 21 -- Services Found to be Most Attractive to Members in Higher Education as Reported by State Associations

Service most attractive	Number of state education association responses				
	A				
	Special	Other	B	C	Total
Economic (economic and special services, insurance and salary data, salary research, pension advice, fringe benefits, insurance coverage, credit union, membership fee)	5	10	11	5	31
Legislative (professional negotiation and welfare, legislation, legal negotiation, professional rights and responsibilities, involvement).	8	6	5	0	19
Information (research bulletins, annual state conference, conferences, newsletter, contact with others, articles in journal, publications, research, TEPS, recruitment, coordination).	7	11	4	0	22
None reported	0	1	3	2	6
Total number of state education associations.	6	11	13	7	37

TABLE 22 - Major Problems Confronting State Associations in Higher Education as Reported by the State Associations

Problems in higher education	Number of state education association responses				
	A				
	Special	Other	B	C	Total
Characteristics of the association (k-12 image not appealing, not equipped to serve this level, united profession membership requirements, negotiations, long history of neglect, merger, development of affiliation procedures, acceptance by the k-12 teachers). . . .	5	3	1	1	10
Financial considerations (need for additional staff and budget, dues too high, adequate financial support, insufficient funds, financial).	3	2	3	1	9
Characteristics of higher education (other professional organizations, multiple sources of control, difficulties in achieving unity among faculty, battle between liberal arts and education, coordination of efforts, apathy, reaching faculty, inadequate state support of state supported institutions, implementing the program in higher education).	6	10	10	4	30
None reported	0	0	3	1	4
Total number of state education associations.	6	11	13	7	37

TABLE 23 -- State Education Associations and Their Group Placement Based on Their Policy Regarding Higher Education

Association	Group	Association	Group
Alabama	A	Mississippi	B
Alabama (ASTA)	D(B)	Mississippi (MTA)	NR
Alaska	B	Missouri	NR
Arizona	C	Montana	B
Arkansas	A	Nebraska	A
Arkansas (ATA)	A	Nevada	C
California	A-Special	New Hampshire	D(C)
Colorado	D(A)	New Jersey	A-Special
Connecticut	D(A)	New Mexico	B
Delaware	C	New York	NR
District of Columbia	D(B)	North Carolina	NR
Florida	D(A)	North Carolina (NCTA)	A
Georgia	D(C)	North Dakota	A
Georgia (GTEA)	NR	Ohio	B
Hawaii	A	Oklahoma	B
Idaho	B	Oregon	NR
Illinois	A-Special	Pennsylvania	A-Special
Indiana	A	Rhode Island	C
Iowa	B	South Carolina	A
Kansas	A	South Dakota	D(C)
Kentucky	B	Tennessee	A
Louisiana	D(B)	Texas	A
Louisiana (LEA)	D(B)	Utah	C
Maine	C	Vermont	B
Maryland	D(A)	Virginia	NR
Massachusetts	NR	Washington	A-Special
Michigan	A-Special	West Virginia	B
Minnesota	B	Wisconsin	NR
		Wyoming	C

VI. POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS OF PENDING AMENDMENTS

The Task Force on Higher Education gave consideration to the possible implications for higher education if two of the amendments to the Bylaws now pending were to receive favorable consideration by the delegates in Dallas. Consideration was also given to the proposals of the Task Force on NEA-Departmental Relations.

The two pending amendments to be voted on in Dallas are Amendment 15 and Amendment 16. Amendment 16 provides that every person enrolled in a department of the NEA must also be a member of the NEA if he is eligible for active membership. If passed this amendment would become effective as of September 1969.

Amendment 15 provides for the establishment of two categories of national affiliates: departments and educational societies. Included as a department is the American Association for Higher Education. The amendment also provides for the allocation of $3 of each member's dues to the department of which he is a member.

At the present time the budget for AAHE is $200,100. Under the provisions of Amendment 15, AAHE would receive about $72,000, based on $3 per member for 24,000 members.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that under these conditions neither AAHE or NFA could operate at the present level of activity. At stake, in fact, is the survival of the two groups. NFA requires NEA membership now, but its future role -- especially its budget after it ceases to be a special project -- is in doubt. AAHE has no separate dues structure at the present time. In this respect, AAHE is like the Association of Classroom Teachers; it is totally supported from the NEA Budget. Therefore, the Task Force agrees with those individuals who believe that "the NEA would suffer a damaging blow in prestige, strength, and influence" if departments were forced to leave the NEA as a result of passage of Amendment 15 and Amendment 16. From the point of view of higher education the impact would be particularly severe for AACTE, NAWDC, and AST.

For these reasons the Task Force supports the report of the Task Force on NEA - Departmental Relations. It also supports the alternative proposal -- a substitute amendment. Under the substitute proposal there are to be established, if approved by the delegates in Dallas, separate categories of affiliation and each group would then need to choose the category most compatible with its own goals. What decisions AAHE, NFA, AACTE, AST, and NAWDC would make would, in turn, greatly influence the level of financial support obtained from the NEA. Most critical at the moment is the decision which AAHE would make since its financial support is a major item -- $200,100 for 1967-68 and a basic budget of $205,000 for 1968-69.

The Executive Committee of AAHE has been examining the future relationship of AAHE and the NEA. After studying the report of Task Force on NEA - Departmental Relations, the AAHE leadership indicated that the group would probably elect "National Affiliate" status.[1] Under the financial provisions for this type of affiliation, independent dues would be charged; however, the NEA may supplement the dues receipts. The case from the point of view of AAHE is presented thoroughly in a resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of AAHE. (A similar resolution was adopted by the 23rd National Conference on Higher Education in March. Below is the full text of the resolution:

---

[1] For a full description of the proposal of the Task Force on NEA - Departmental Relations see the NEA Journal (April 1968) 26-29.

> It is the concern of the American Association for Higher Education Executive Committee that the National Conference on Higher Education be continued and that appropriate steps be taken to assure strength for the AAHE itself.
>
> Continuation of the present relationship of AAHE with NEA will necessitate, among other things, sharply increased fees for new AAHE members beginning in 1968-69. One reason for this is the "Minneapolis amendment" (1967), which established as a prerequisite to AAHE membership that the individual must join his state education association and his local education association (if available) in addition to the NEA. Furthermore, the enlarging gap between the broad aims of the AAHE, as reflected in the National Conference, and the growing emphasis on, and apparently dominant preoccupation with, collective negotiations on the part of the NEA threatens continued close affiliation with the NEA.
>
> There is continuing and increasing need for a national forum on higher education issues and opportunities of the caliber exemplified by the National Conference. There is continuing and increasing need for an agency to represent individuals in higher education as well as organizations representing institutional concerns. Such representation is needed by all partners of higher education -- faculty members, administrators, governing boards, and students -- and from all types of institutions.
>
> Organizations oriented towards individuals need substantial autonomy of action and program. In addition, they need some form of national body similar to the AAHE which can represent with authority and strength at the national level those matters which are of common concern, and can also provide a forum for continuing dialogue on matters at issue.
>
> For a variety of reasons -- the growth of individually oriented organizations in need of an overarching affiliation, the need for some agency to represent individuals concerned with higher education in ways similar to the way the American Council on Education reflects institutional concerns, and the growing gap between the professional and scholarly interests of the AAHE on the one hand and the increasing concern of the NEA with problems of the material welfare of teachers, as sought through collective negotiations, on the other -- it appears wise for the AAHE to move away from its present close affiliation with the NEA. This movement may take the form of a "National Affiliate" or "Associate Organization" type of relationship as recommended by the report of the Task Force on NEA - Depart-

> mental Relationships (sic). Or it may be a transition to an autonomous status, gradual or rapid, depending on whether the Representative Assembly of the NEA provides for multiple kinds of relationships or insists on a single form.
>
> To facilitate the needed planning for these several eventualities, the Executive Secretary and Administrative Committee are directed to seek planning funds from outside sources. This planning should include informal conversations with officers of other organizations to explore possible subsequent relationships, and the preparation of plans for a possible eventual new association of individually oriented organizations or an autonomous AAHE.
>
> Early implementation of these efforts is necessary to assure continuity of the National Conference and strengthened national professional leadership for higher education.[2]

The Task Force on NEA - Departmental Relations spoke of three types of affiliation -- departments, national affiliates, and associated organizations. Each is less closely tied to the NEA than the former. In the AAHE resolution, mention was made of either national affiliate or associated organization. No mention was made of a department affiliation -- the closest relationship.

Members of the Task Force on Higher Education were in general agreement that, if the substitution is made for Amendments 15 and 16, if the substitute is approved by the delegates, and if AAHE options to become a "Department" encompassing all concerns of all educators in higher education, the NEA then should provide financial and other resources to the extent possible consistent with NEA priorities.

Some members of the Task Force believe that, if AAHE options to become a "National Affiliate", the NEA should gradually phase-out its financial support over a period of time, probably four years. At least one member of the Task Force strongly believes that, if AAHE selects the "National Affiliate" category, all direct financial support should be curtailed immediately.

Selection of the "Associated Organizations" category would, of course, indicate an immediate curtailment of financial support from the NEA budget.

Solution to the dilemma may well require considerable patience and soul-searching by all parties before a solution acceptable to all is found. The Task Force encourages the participants to keep basic purposes foremost in their deliberations. What is the balance between division and unity?

---

[2] College and University Bulletin (April 15, 1968), 5.

VII. WHAT SHOULD BE THE ROLE OF NEA IN HIGHER EDUCATION?[1]

Higher Education Growth: Membership Potential

The NEA Board of Directors has charged the Task Force on Higher Education "to define the role and chart a course for the NEA in the field of higher education. . ..", with emphasis on gathering data and projecting the consequences and implications of alternative courses of action available to the Board. This report is an effort to analyze the alternatives open to the National Education Association's Executive Committee and the Board of Directors concerning the future role of the NEA in the field of higher education.

For informational and background purposes that have direct bearing upon membership potential, it is important to note some of the trends that have been predicted in the field of higher education. The Office of Education predicted that from November, 1966-67 to October, 1976-77, the need for additional full-time equivalent professional staff in institutions of higher education will be 445,000 (277,000 as replacements; 168,000 as additions), starting from a 1963 full-time equivalent base of 385,000.

Additional information for long range planning is provided by William S. Graybeal, NEA Research Division, in projections to the year 1976 in his background information paper. (See Section IV above). It appears from this report that continuing substantial increases in the need for faculty and staff will occur, though the rate of growth during the closing years of this period will not be as large as they are at the present time.

Any analysis of long range projection is subject to due caution. There is considerable growth potential for NEA in higher education, but the decision among alternatives should rest upon other considerations.

Many organizations, including the NEA, are interested in the emerging growth of two-year community and junior colleges, as well as four-year universities and colleges. The NEA, which has been largely elementary-secondary in its orientation and programs, now confronts the question of what its future role should be in higher education. Should the NEA continue to have a role in higher education, and if so, in what areas or programs should it concentrate its efforts?

The above question sets the direction of this analysis in terms of delineating what the consequences or probable effects might be if the NEA decides either to enter the field of higher education in a renewed effort or to continue in its present course, or to take other courses of action. The purpose of this analysis is not to make the policy judgment, but to aid the policy makers by illuminating the implications of alternative courses of action open to the NEA.

---

[1] This section is a summary of a special study prepared for the Task Force on Higher Education by Professor Ernest G. Miller and Mr. William Hinkle of the Graduate School of Public Affairs, the University of Washington.

The general purpose and objectives of the NEA center on the elevation of the character of the teaching profession and the promotion of the cause of education in the United States. It is an all-encompassing organization with many departments and administrative units. Like many organizations involved with the profession of teaching, its environment is one of rapid change. Increasing costs as well as extensive diversification have brought many problems of organizational structure and clientele.

The recommended expenditure budget for the fiscal year 1967-68 totals $11,823,000. The expenditures of the NEA have exceeded its revenues for the last three years. Subsequently, $1,293,000 in surplus funds have been expended in an effort to balance the budget during this period. Although dues will be increased from $10 to $15 effective September 1, 1968, to produce a budget of nearly $14,900,000 for 1968-69, rising costs and demands will absorb much of this increase in revenue.

The greatest source of revenues are membership dues, which accounted for $10,151,000 (minus allowances to associations adopting unification) in the 1967-68 budget. As of May 9, the NEA has a total regular membership of 1,027,176 (excluding students). This includes classroom teachers, school administrators, college professors and administrators, and specialists in schools, colleges, and educational agencies, both public and private.

Present Involvement of NEA in Higher Education

Higher education is served through the NEA in many ways. NEA's legislative program seeks expanded federal funding for higher education. NEA's Research Division studies which range from nursery through graduage education include periodic surveys of salaries in higher education, and teacher supply and demand in higher education. The first studies of salaries scheduled in higher education were initiated in this unit, Faculty Salary Schedules in Colleges and Universities, 1965-67, and Faculty Salary Schedules in Public Community-Junior Colleges, 1965-66. The services of NEA's Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities extends to educators in higher education. The DuShane Fund for Teacher Rights is available to every educator whose rights have been threatened or abridged.

Through the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, NEA contributes financially to the work of NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education). NCATE has accredited 449 colleges and universities, graduating more than 70% of the nation's new teachers each year. Affiliated with the TEPS Commission is the Student NEA which, since 1957 has assisted local and state student education associations in developing programs for college students.

Among the thirty-three special interest organizations affiliated with the NEA are subject-matter departments which enroll individuals from every level of education. In addition the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, an NEA department, has about 2500 members, 17% of whom are NEA members. NAWDC gives attention to the needs of girls and women from the elementary grades through higher education. Further, there is the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), an NEA department, with membership of 775 accredited institutions concerned with the improvement of teacher education programs.

Over the years, many members of NEA Commissions and Standing Committees, and officers of the Association have come from higher education.

NEA's influence in higher education has not been highly visible, aside from AAHE, but these relationships which have provided a link should not be overlooked.

Present Involvement of NEA Affiliated Organizations

With this general view of the NEA's financial and membership record as background, we turn to an examination of the organizations that are affiliated with the NEA in the area of higher education. What is their financial and membership record? These questions are important in the consideration of renewed activities within the realm of higher education.

Presently, only two NEA units, AAHE and NFA-CJC are serving broad professional interests as distinguished from organizations serving special interests.

American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) -- an NEA department with 24,000 members. Membership is concurrent with NEA membership. Individual dues, $15 as of September 1968. Budgeted expenditures for 1967-68, $200,100.

Goals -- The primary goals of AAHE are to advance the professional development of those engaged in higher education and to help make colleges, universities and related agencies increasingly effective in their service to society. It has no identification with any particular discipline or type of college or university. Its goals are broad and general in terms of a professional organization.

National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges (NFA-CJC) -- a special project of the NEA with approximately 500 members. Each member of NFA-CJC automatically a member of AAHE by virtue of being an NEA member employed in higher education. NFA dues $10 plus NEA dues. Budget for 1967-68, is $82,000. (NFA Board of Directors has recommended that NFA dues be discontinued). Chartered in 1967 and completing its first year of operation.

Goals -- NFA-CJC is oriented to the individual faculty member rather than the institution. It strives to serve the welfare of faculties by improving salaries, working conditions, and negotiations as well as by improving professional effectiveness in community and junior colleges. Other goals include a national, state, and local representation on matters of policy or legislation and matters of professional development of community and junior college faculties.

The Association for Student Teaching has applied for affiliation with the National Education Association. The Delegate Assembly in Dallas will vote upon its status as a department which has been recommended by the NEA Board of Directors. Currently this organization has about 4500 members with 350 institutional members and the remainder individual members, about 70% of whom are from higher education. This group centers on the needs of those who work with student teachers.

The following tables graphically reveal that the present activities of NEA in the field of higher education in terms of membership figures have been negligible. Approximately 2.34% of the total regular membership of the NEA is from higher education. The budgetary picture is about the same: 2.75% of the budgetary expenditures have been channeled into AAHE and NFA.

The AAHE brings together on an individual basis interested persons from the several disciplines and colleges and universities as well as others who seek to extend and improve higher education in general. NFA-CJC is the first professional organization on a national basis solely for faculty members in the two-year college.

AAHE renders general services in the field of higher education through its annual conferences, special studies, and the College and University Bulletin. NFA-CJC, which is operating as a special project, is oriented to the organization of campus and state units and provides professional and personal services to membership. Measurable organizational success is easier where the mission of the organization is singular and clear, most difficult where it is multiple and vague. This problem is not confined to the NEA, and other organizations in higher education face the dilemmas posed by institutional vs. individual membership, general vs. specific missions.

The AAUP

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is another organization in the field of higher education with the well defined mission of facilitating the "standards, ideals, and welfare of the profession." The AAUP has indicated an interest in the community-junior college field and has had some success in recruiting faculty members.

This background on the present role of the NEA in higher education and the brief examination of organizational bases and relationships in the area of higher education, suggests some basic conditions that underlie an analysis of the implications of NEA decisions about its role in higher education. (See appendix for description of other organizations involved in higher education.)

The Issue of NEA's Future Role in Higher Education

The Task Force on Higher Education selected five alternative courses of action that the NEA may take within higher education:

TABLE 24 -- Membership of Higher Education in the NEA (1967-68)
(By Percentages)

Total NEA Membership	AAHE	Percentage	NFA-CJC	Percentage	NAWDC	Percentage
1,028,456	24,000[1]	2.33	500[2]	0.048	425[3]	0.041

[1] Estimated. Figure is generally agreed upon although records are not available.

[2] Estimated. Figure is provided by the Executive Director of NFA-CJC.

[3] Total membership is approximately 2,500 of which 17% are members of NEA.

TABLE 25 -- NEA Expenditures Related to Higher Education (1967-68)
(By Percentages)

Total Expenditures	AAHE	Percentage	NFA-CJC	Percentage
$11,823,000	$200,100	1.69	$75,000[1]	0.64

Note: NAWDC is not included because the department has its own dues and is not a line item in the NEA Budget.

[1] NFA-CJC with 500 members would collect $5,000 in dues above the $75,000 assigned in the Budget as a special project.

TABLE 26 -- Total Percentages - Membership and Expenditures
(1967-68)
(Higher Education)

Membership	Expenditure
2.419	2.33

a. Restrict its role in higher education to a concern for personnel involved in the preparation of teachers.

b. Restrict its role in higher education to community-junior college segment.

c. Continue its present role in higher education.

d. Restrict its role to the elementary-secondary segment of education by withdrawing completely from the area of higher education.

e. Expand its activities in higher education to become the primary individual membership organization in the field of higher education.

The alternative courses of action for the NEA have been analyzed by means of a comparative cost-benefit method. Various factors affecting the ultimate decisions have been considered: finances, membership, organizational relationships (external and internal) and public image relationships in terms of the costs and the benefits to be derived from each alternative choice.

The findings of this analysis were used by the Task Force in arriving at its proposal.

VIII. A PROPOSAL OUTLINING A ROLE FOR NEA IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Basic Assumption: The NEA should continue to have a role in higher education, and higher education should continue to have a role in the NEA. In fact, these roles could be expanded to the mutual advantage of the NEA and its higher education sector.

Other Assumptions:

1. The NEA should seek to increase its role in higher education because of its fundamental commitment to "elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching..." Its raison d'etre requires that the Association be involved in the concerns of higher education. It is not without significance that two recent NEA presidents were from higher education as is the treasurer of the Association, seven members of the Board of Directors, and at least 23 members on NEA commissions and committees. The link with higher education has been very real.

It is for this reason that the Association's involvement in higher education should be strengthened and not solely as a means of attracting a large number of new members. Although it is clear from the research data that the potential membership in higher education is considerable.

In 1966-67, it is estimated that there were 262,000 full-time persons employed for resident degree credit courses. If the NEA were as successful in this sector as it has been in the elementary-secondary sector, it could expect to enlist about one-half of the potential or about 131,000. In addition, there is doubtless some potential in the part-time and junior instructional staff. Since 24,000 of the full-time staff are already members of the NEA, a reasonable figure, being optimistic, is that another 107,000 might be enrolled if the NEA could organize a unified effort at the state level and if an attractive package of welfare and professional services could be offered.

In order to come close to the figure, a merger would need to be realized between the AAHE and the AAUP. Since the AAUP has about 90,000 members, this would provide over 100,000 members when duplicate memberships are deleted and when a place is found in a new structure for members in higher education who do not qualify for AAUP membership.

When the higher education faculty estimates are projected a decade to 1976-77, the total full-time figure becomes 376,000 for resident degree credit courses. Again assuming an ability to attract one-half of the potential under ideal conditions, the reasonable expectation would become 188,000 members. In addition, it is estimated that part-time and junior instructional staff would increase 286,000.

However, one must reckon realistically with the knowledge that the NEA has never attracted a very significant number of people from higher education. Recruitment at this level has always been difficult.

2. The second assumption is that the profession in higher education will be organized. There are clear signs that some collective action is winning campus approval, especially among the younger members of the profession and specifically in the community-junior college ranks and in the state colleges. A force in the tide of change is the recognition by powerful groups in higher education that the choice is not between a faculty organization and no faculty organization, but rather that the choice is between which type of faculty organization. On the one hand, there is the collegial approach advocated by AAUP and AAHE and, on the other hand, there is the adversary role advocated by the AFT. In between is the professional negotiations approach of the NEA-NFA. Powerful and prestigious associations such as the American Council on Education believe that the collegial approach is preferable. If the NEA accepts this assumption can the NEA afford to have any organization other than the NEA assume this responsibility? Can SNEA continue to prosper if their professors owe primary allegiance to some other organization? The NEA has always had a vital interest in the preparation of teachers which means that it is extremely advantageous for the NEA to have strong representation in institutions of higher education.

The NEA should not only concentrate on developing a welfare program attractive to the campus instructor but should also continue and enlarge its efforts to design a professional development program through TEPS, SNEA, AACTE, NCATE, and AST.

3. A third assumption is that no successful effort to recruit a substantial NEA following is possible without the strong support of state associations. As one examines the enrollment figures for the NEA in general, one must conclude that membership is high in the states which have strong state education associations. The axiom is as valid for higher education. The whole can be no greater than its parts.

There are probably no more than ten states with well developed programs for higher education within the state association. These should be studied and emulated in forty other states under assistance from the NEA. Success is impossible otherwise. It is, therefore, noteworthy to observe that the top priority in the AAHE list of expanded services is the strengthening of state and local associations. However, even this step is not enough. The AAHE should give this item top priority in its entire program by shifting its resources to that end.

4. A fourth assumption is that the NEA should pursue its goal in higher education on a program basis rather than on the present departmental basis. Throughout the entire NEA a multitude of efforts -- too often unrelated -- serve higher education. These efforts can and must be unified into one concerted program with specific direction to agreed upon ends. Planning and budgeting must be joined together by programming so that AAHE, SNEA, AST, TEPS, NCATE, NFA and AACTE move with harmony and with the support of research, legislation, professional rights and responsibilities, etc.

5. A fifth assumption is that the higher education sector is different from the elementary-secondary sector. Higher education is made up of very large and very small institutions. It has a history of independence. It is private

and public. It has strong and active institutional organizations to speak for it. Generally speaking, it tends to be more introspective and independent, more self-governing, and more self-centered than other sectors. Instructional staff people on the campus tend to consider individuality a badge of courage and collective action a mark of weakness unless the group is discipline oriented and thereby provides an outlet publication and an inlet for information which can help the member gain his twin goals of tenure and promotion. The NEA cannot offer means to these ends. The approaches which have worked so well to recruit in the elementary and secondary school area will have to be reshaped to be effective in higher education.

6. The final assumption is that an operable program to provide a strong role for the NEA must come from within those elements of higher education which are now in the NEA. While the Task Force and the Board of Directors can point a direction, the development of a program of action must carry a design and structure imposed from within rather than from without. But a program structure must be developed before the NEA can be reasonably expected to finance it with the large sums which will be needed. The Task Force gave some attention to possible models. (See Attachment A.)

Recommendations

1. The Task Force strongly endorses the principle stated in the AAHE priority to strengthen the efforts of local and state associations in higher education. Here it is assumed that an accelerator factor will need to operate by which AAHE places major assistance with state leaders with the expectation that the states will work with the local associations. The NEA should appropriate enough additional money in the 1968-69 budget to permit the immediate employment of a staff person to work with the states in strengthening the role of state and local associations in higher education. In this area, an additional person can greatly improve state contacts for AAHE and NFA. This is the best utilization of the first dollar investment because it augurs the best and most immediate return. At least $35,000 should be provided to launch this activity.

2. The NEA should set up with AAHE, NFA and other groups an in-house planning team (as suggested in Assumption 6) to develop a program for higher education which provides a new role for the NEA in higher education and for higher education in the NEA. Specifically, this team should develop a detailed program such as is indicated in Attachment B.

To support this planning team, the Budget Committee should appropriate about $10,000. Prior to final authorization, a preliminary design of the study should be approved by the appropriate authority; i.e., the Executive Secretary or his Deputy.

The total new appropriation for 1968-69 could be about $45,000 but, for the following year and the three or four years to follow, the figure would climb substantially. The extent of the increase would be dependent upon the type of program and the priorities developed as well as the ability of the design to generate the results its designers predict. It is, therefore, extremely significant that the decision-makers keep in mind that the decision to be made is not a $45,000 decision, but a much larger decision -- probably close to $750,000 over the next five years, beyond the $300,000 a year now being spent on AAHE and NFA.

3. The Task Force recommends that the NFA discontinue its special $10.00 dues for membership as of September 1, 1968. By this action, a junior college or community college member of the NEA would be considered a member of NFA in the same way as an elementary or secondary school teacher who is an NEA member belongs to ACT.

4. The Task Force urges the NEA to expedite the development of a process by which rapid identification of members serving in higher education can be made, thereby enabling more efficient service.

5. The Task Force encourages the AAHE to continue its high quality annual conference with a conference planner designated this responsibility so that the balance of the staff can concentrate on providing services to individual members and to state and local associations.

6. The Task Force encourages AAHE and NFA to stress in their publications the importance of strong and effective state and local associations and to provide specific ways through publications of strengthening membership participation.

7. The Task Force recommends that the National Council of State Education Associations help in the formation of a new unit comprising state staff workers with primary responsibility for working in the field of higher education.

8. The Task Force recommends that encouragement be given to the states to select persons who have been active in higher education to join the state staffs and to work with higher education groups.

9. The Task Force recommends that the NEA strengthen the service units of the Association so that they can provide greater assistance to higher education. Similarly, the service units need help in coordinating their efforts with higher education. These groups include but are not limited to the following: legislative, special services, research, data processing, field operations, information services, NTL, etc.

10. The Task Force recommends the adoption of the proposal of the Task Force on Departmental Relations as a substitute for Amendments 15 and 16. The passage of the two proposed amendments would do serious harm to higher education units by making recruiting more difficult.

Attachment A

Tentative Models for Consideration

The Task Force provides the following model as an example of its thinking but strongly urges that the NEA listen carefully to other designs. Therefore, this is not a specific design but rather a suggestion submitted for consideration.

An Organizational Model

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">An American Association for Higher Education</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Senior Colleges</td><td colspan="2">Community-Junior Colleges</td></tr>
<tr><td>Administrative Unit</td><td>Faculty Unit</td><td>Administrative Unit</td><td>Faculty Unit</td></tr>
</table>

The governance within such a model would provide for representation and policy-making within each sector and within the entire model. Hence, there could be an AAHE Board of Directors with representation from each sector and a delegate assembly for policy formation. Similarly, each sector would have its own board and address itself to those concerns indigenous to it. Perhaps the boards of directors for senior colleges and for community-junior colleges would be the combined boards of the separate administrative and faculty units. It is even possible that the board for AAHE could be the composite of all boards. Such an organizational pattern probably could not be fully developed and operable immediately. It would, however, provide an organizational home for the NFA-CJC now. If, in the future, the AAUP would join the structure, there would be an organic position for it.

A Program Model

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">American Association for Higher Education
State Associations for Higher Education
Campus Associations for Higher Education</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Senior Colleges</td><td colspan="2">Community-Junior Colleges</td></tr>
<tr><td>Academic Affairs</td><td>Professional Welfare</td><td>Academic Affairs</td><td>Professional Welfare</td></tr>
</table>

The program model follows the organizational model and permits room for considerable development. Consideration might be given to imposing the committee structure on the program model rather than on the organizational model.

However, in the final analysis, the models developed should come from higher education and should precede financial investment by the NEA.

Attachment B

Outlined here are some of the tasks to which the in-house planning team should dedicate its efforts.

1. Identify the needs. Every organization serves a public. Here the public is higher education within the context of a profession unified from pre-school through the graduate school. The changing perspective about teachers rights will have its impact in higher education as in the elementary and secondary school sector. One can expect that there will be increasing need for economic services (salary data, fringe benefits, insurance coverage), legislative services (negotiation techniques, academic freedom, political influence) and information services (conferences, publications, research findings). The NEA is uniquely equipped to assist in shaping action programs to strengthen the professional development and welfare of all members of the teaching profession.

2. Establish the goals. Goals should be developed for the next five to six years based on the needs identified. The goals should be specific. Examples: a) increase membership by 3,000 for each of the next five years; b) have a completely functioning higher education department within each state association by 1973. Priorities should be set for the goals.

3. Set objectives. The objectives are the goals reduced to one budget period and reflect the input-output factors for that period for each objective. Again, these should be specific and should reflect a priority system. It will also be necessary to develop the measures of output. While one must concede that many phases of education are difficult to measure, inexact measures are better than none at all.

4. Design a program structure. The public to be served has identified needs for which goals have been set and objectives have been created to realize the steps in meeting the goals. This arrangement needs a program structure which sets forth the major categories, subcategories, elements, and factors. Higher education might be a program category. NFA might be a subcategory. Professional negotiations might be an element. The number of contracts negotiated might be a factor. Thus, the program structure includes both input and output measures in relation to objectives set by policy and provided for by budget appropriations.

5. Prepare a program financial plan. The PFP is fundamental to the entire concept. It provides the means by which the decision-makers can evaluate the costs and benefits of the program. It differs from the traditional budget request because it recognizes the input by program rather than by the unit expending the appropriation. Hence, while research might be vital to planning and analyzing in higher education and, therefore, a part of the PFP, the funds would not be expended by AAHE.

6. Provision for review and analysis. Review and analysis should be scheduled for regular intervals -- monthly or quarterly. The purpose is to provide the

individuals responsible for the program with a review and analysis of the program at interim points to enable decisions to be made as necessary in order that the stated objective can be realized. If the objective is to recruit 3,000 members for NFA in 1970-71 and the second quarterly review and analysis indicates that only 500 members have been recruited while 60 percent of the budget has been expended, the decision-maker can see before the end of the year that he has a problem and take steps to alter the results.

7. Conduct special studies. Introspection is a part of the system described. Special studies provide the means of conducting in-depth analysis of segments of the program.

APPENDIX

A STUDY OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

American Council on Education

Background

The American Council on Education was founded in 1918. It was a council of national and regional education associations and institutions of higher education. Memberships as of February 1, 1967, included 189 national and regional associations and organizations, 1,261 institutions of higher education, and 50 affiliated institutions and organizations. Membership in the Council is by organization or institution, not by individual.

Logan Wilson is the president of the Council. As president he is the executive head. The chairman is the elected head and serves for a period of one year. For 1966-67 the chairman was John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State University. This year the chairman is Sharvy G. Umbeck, president, Knox College. ACE has a staff of about 100 persons including 24 professionals. It also has five national commissions: Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, Federal Relations, International Education, and Plans and Objectives for Higher Education.

Purpose

"Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations and institutions."

Budget

The operative budget for the year ending December 31, 1968, is $2,391,800, an increase of $42,110 over the previous year. Membership dues contributed $535,000, less than 23 per cent of the receipts. The largest single source of revenue was $653,000 from publications. For the year it was necessary to transfer $700,000 from the reserve to the General Fund.

Annual dues are: constituent organization members, $375 (the American Association for Higher Education is a constituent organization member); associated organization members, $155; institutional members, $140 to $1000, depending upon type of institution and enrollment; and affiliates, $90.

History

The American Council on Education is observing its fiftieth anniversary. In January, 1918, four national education associations met in an effort to coordinate efforts and thereby contribute to World War I. Created to serve this end was the Emergency Council on Education. By March, membership had grown to fourteen organizations and peace was not far away. Realizing that coordination was as important in peace as in war, the group surrendered its emergency nature and became the American Council on Education in July, 1918. One of the founding organizations of the ACE was the NEA as were two of its departments; the National Council of Education and the Department of Superintendence.

Since its founding ACE has had five presidents. Logan Wilson resigned as chancellor of the University of Texas to become president on July 1, 1961. Since 1962 the Council has grown rapidly in membership, service and effectiveness. As now organized the Council elects at its annual meeting in October a chairman, vice chairman, secretary and treasurer. These officers with the president join eighteen elected members to constitute the board of directors. The board of directors is the governing body of the Council. Voting at the annual meeting is by institution.

Activities

ACE serves as a clearing house of information relative to higher education. The varied and multiple activities of the Council are reflected through its publications. The Education Record is the quarterly journal of the Council. In addition the five commissions publish newsletters and reports. The Council supports an Office of Research which produces many publications including A Fact Book on Higher Education - a vital compendium of information on all phases of higher education. Recent books published by the Council include: American Junior Colleges (7th Edition) by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.; Computers on Campus by John Caffrey and Charles J. Mosmann; The Mobile Professor by David G. Brown; and Improving College Teaching by Calvin B. T. Lee.

The annual meeting included discussion of papers prepared in advance. For the fiftieth annual meeting the topic was "Whose Goals for American Higher Education." Each of the constituencies was heard -- students, faculty, administrators, trustees and the public. Those preparing the papers are paid. Reactions are also prepared to foster the dialogue.

Comments

In gathering information relating to the American Council on Education, Dr. Logan Wilson was interviewed. His comments were direct but should be treated as "off-the-record" remarks. In reviewing the history of ACE, Wilson pointed out that the Council formerly included secondary schools, but has left that field to the NEA.

Membership is institutional - a fact which provides both strength and weakness. Obviously the Council attempts to insert harmony into the cacophony of voices arising from the academic community. Speaking before a seminar on Challenge and Change in American Education at Harvard in 1962, Francis Keppel observed that ACE is

> ...The largest organization for higher education. Its membership included institutions of higher learning, represented by their presidents, and groups such as the Association of Land Grant Universities and the Associations of Urban Universities, which have subgroups for their members. Like NEA, ACE is troubled with a changing membership, though to a lesser degree. An additional problem for ACE is the range of its constituencies; among its members are the smallest colleges and the largest universities, as well as both public and private institutions.[1]

---

[1] Seymour Harris, editor, Challenge and Change in American Education, p. 67.

While its list of chairmen reads like a roll call of Who's Who in Higher Education, the broad base of support prevents ACE from being a bold adventurer; hence, its program and its research are supportive of broad policy. On the other hand, the nature of its membership and the process of its governance make decision easier. Wilson does concede that direct faculty voice is absent since the institutions are represented by the presidents. One staff member - Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr. - believes that ACE should do more for the individual member.

Individual faculty members, Wilson believes, are served by the learned societies in academic matters and by AAUP on matters related to working conditions. In respect to the latter, Wilson stated, "A merger of AAUP and AAHE would be helpful." There is no question but what Logan Wilson has conceded that the individual faculty member is seeking a voice in campus governance and there is no doubt that Wilson prefers the AAHE - AAUP pattern to a union. In fact, ACE will soon send out a position paper on unionism to warn its members.

Community Junior Colleges are eligible for membership in ACE and many have joined but ACE has no special role for that group. The American Association of Junior Colleges is one of the constituent organization members.

What trends will shape higher education in the decades ahead? Logan Wilson perceives a continuation of the present rapid growth pattern into the 1970's before leveling off. Enrollment growth and the related problem of physical facilities will not be as significant in the long run as will be the growth of knowledge and its implications on the campus. Growth in enrollment and knowledge will multiply the importance of coordination. Also the growth will influence the balance in higher education with a greater percentage of the production coming from the public sector through growth of state universities, state colleges, and publicly supported community colleges.

Faculty concerns are as varied as the institutions. The University of California has a different set of faculty problems from Harvard University. Different areas and different types of institutions give rise to differing faculty concerns. For example, student unrest is a major issue at many large state universities, viz, Wisconsin and California but not a small private college such as Swarthmore. The conclusion Wilson reaches is that there is greater diversity within faculties and among faculties in higher education than there is in the elementary-secondary sector.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

Background

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges is the oldest organization of institutions of higher education. It was founded in 1887. Under a re-organization plan in 1963, three organizations merged to form the present group: the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (1887) joined with the National Association of State Universities (1895) and the State Universities Association (1918).

Membership is institutional. Currently there are 90 member institutions with, obviously, limited expansion possibilities.[1] Member institutions are located in all fifty states and Puerto Rico. Thus it can be seen that fewer than five per cent of 2,200 colleges and universities are members but the member institutions do enroll nearly 30 per cent of all students, do award about 30 per cent of all bachelor's degrees, do grant 40 per cent of all master's degrees, and do confer 60 per cent of all doctorates.

What distinguishes NASULGC from many of its fellow organizations is its long history. History towers over the deliberations of the Association. One must be mindful that the majority of the member institutions grew out of the Ordinance of 1787 and the Northwest Ordinance or the Morrill Act of 1862. Therefore its member institutions tend to be the older and well-established universities whereas those institutions composing the membership of the newer Association of State Colleges and Universities tend to be newer or changing institutions. From the long reach of its history and from the prestigious position of its institutions come an impressive array of statistics -- more than half of all living American Nobel Prize winners and nearly half of the members of the National Academy of Sciences, half the nation's governors, senators, and congressmen are alumni of member institutions.

Purpose

Article II of the constitution presents the purpose of the Association:

> The purpose of this Association shall be the consideration of questions relating to the promotion of higher education in all its phases in the universities and Land-Grant colleges of the states of the Union, and the discussion of such questions and formulation of such plans, policies, and programs as may tend to make the member institutions of the Association more effective in their work.

---

[1] The 99 member institutions break down as follows: 68 are land-grant institutions, 31 are state universities, and two of the 68 land-grant institutions are privately controlled - Cornell and Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

This purpose may be accomplished:

1. By cooperation and unity of effort among and by the member institutions.
2. By the maintenance of proper and legal relationships between the member institutions and the Federal government as well as with other organizations, institutions, and agencies supported by public or private funds.
3. By appropriate action on proposed or actual Federal programs affecting the several state universities and Land-Grant colleges.

The programs in pursuit of the purpose are carried out by a relatively small staff of five professionals but with considerable help from the member institutions.

Governance

In 1965, the Association adopted a major reorganization plan designed to streamline the organizational structure. Preserved in the reorganization were certain practices rooted in conviction; for example, the body is cooperative and each member institution is equally represented regardless of size, and the body is not a control group but rather a consultative and cooperative body to help member institutions. The Senate is the principal policy-making body. It is composed of the chief executive officers of all the member institutions, and it meets at the annual meeting in November. In addition to making policy and directing the activities of the Association, the Senate appoints and receives reports from all the standing, special, and joint committees. To conduct the affairs of the Association between meetings of the Senate, there is a 15-member executive committee. Current Senate Committees are:

Executive Committee
Information Committee
Advisory Committee (Office of Institutional Research)
Committee on Voluntary Support
International Affairs
National Defense
Radio and Television
Water Resources

Special Committees are:

Special Committee on Federal Legislation
Committee on Industrial Extension
Task Force on State Universities and Public Policy
Traffic Safety Research and Education
Educational Opportunities for Minority Groups

In addition there are many joint committees with other associations.

The councils within the Association are: Council of Presidents, Council for Academic Affairs, Council for Business Affairs, Council on Extension, and the Division of Agriculture which functions much like a council. Also working within the structure are seven commissions devoted to special interests.

The officers of the Association are: president, president-elect, chairman of the executive committee, and executive director. The latter is appointed by the Senate. The other three officers are elected by the Senate with the chairman of the Executive Committee being the immediate past president.

President until November was James H. Jansen, president of Oregon State University. Succeeding Dr. Jansen is W. Clarke Wescoe, Chancellor of the University of Kansas. Edgar F. Shannon, Jr. as past president served in 1967 as chairman of the executive committee. Executive director for the past twenty-one years has been Russell I. Thackrey.

The most recent financial report available is for the fiscal year 1966. (The fiscal year coincides with the calendar year.) Total receipts, including $170,095.00 from dues, were $216,161.01. Disbursements totalled $204,552.27. Hence, it can be seen that the Association for 1966 was in a sound financial position. For 1967, the proposed budget for expenditures reflected a total of $208,868.40, which, like the membership in the Association, is stable. Anticipated dues collections will be up from $170,095.00 (1966) to an estimated $184,165.00 (1967).

Dues for 1967 are $550 per member institution plus $85 per thousand students enrolled, or a fraction thereof.[2]

Activities

In addition to the annual meetings, the Association conducts an extensive research program and publications program. Three newsletters are sent out: The Circular Letter which is published about 40 times a year (since it is always on green paper, it has come to be known as "The Green Sheet"), For Your Information which is published about 20 times a year for an audience outside higher education, and The International Newsletter.

Comments

The comments below are based on an interview with the executive director, Russell I. Thackrey.)

The changes which Dr. Thackrey perceived for the coming decade included a growing involvement in higher education by the Federal government, mounting faculty unrest, and growth of unions. Two new areas which will become concerns of higher education to a larger extent will be: (1) the university and public service and (2) the university in urban affairs. As was pointed out recently in Changing Times, colleges will become more urban with the 20 story classroom building replacing the ivy quadrangle. The large university will become -- to use Clark Kerr's term -- a "multiversity" double and triple the present size.[3]

---

[2] Source: Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges: 80th Annual Convention, pp. 32-36.

It will be big, sprawling, anonymous -- with both individual faculty members and students belonging to the lonely crowd.

To set a basis for discussion and to adopt a position on issues the Association has prepared a joint statement with the Association of State Colleges and Universities -- "Recommendations for National Action Affecting Higher Education." This statement of position may be equated to the platform of a political party. For example, the Association is vitally concerned with the implications of the various student loan programs. It is opposed to all forms of tax credits. Dr. Thackrey spent the major part of his annual report warning the members of the Senate of the dangers involved. The reasons given for opposition do not include the primary reason -- private colleges. Surely most programs of a tax credit nature or a deferred payment type would help private colleges. The alternative is that state universities and colleges will grow much larger while privately endowed colleges will struggle desperately for survival. By the mid-1970's enrollments in higher education will be up almost 40 per cent to 9,000,000 with the bulk of the increase going to state colleges and universities. The other side of the debate holds one salient point -- the need to hold tuition costs down. Favored as a means of achieving this end is to increase state support through taxation. Here the argument is that education benefits both the individual and society.

The problem of the community college is generally considered outside the Association's area of concern; however, in Kentucky, Indiana, and Pennsylvania the community colleges are parts of the university system.

Other trends evident for the future include the problem of coordinating higher education, of individualizing instruction, of improving financial management, of involving faculty in campus governance, of extending equal education opportunity (whereas the Negro represents 11 per cent of the population, he represents only 4 per cent of the college population), and of student evaluation of instruction.)

Faculty concerns will remain essentially the same: salaries, working conditions, and governance. The question about governance seems to have shifted to how much responsibility is the faculty willing to accept for decisions. Needless to say, the Association's position is pro-trustees and anti-Galbraith. (The reference is to John Kenneth Galbraith and specifically to his speech at the University of California, Berkeley last April in which he argued, in part, that governing boards were not yet harmless anachronisms but rather barriers to rational progress and that "the modern faculty" should run the university.[4] How could the chief executive officers of the nation's state universities take a position declaring that lay governing boards are anachronistic!

---

[3] See Changing Times (January 1968) p. 16.

[4] For a shortened version of Galbraith's speech, see College Management (September 1967), 32-36.

To Dr. Thackrey the decision NEA faces is whether or not AAHE will represent all of higher education or only public higher education. The problem is: Can NEA speak for public elementary and secondary education and yet speak for all of higher education?

Like so many other leaders in higher education, Dr. Thackrey felt that the ambiguous position of NEA caused it to take an erroneous position by opposing the Higher Education Facilities bill in 1962 on the basis that tax money should be used for public education only. While the principle may have merit at the elementary-secondary level, it is not equally applicable in higher education. To some extent NEA, according to Dr. Thackrey, changed its position by remaining silent when the issue came up in 1963.

The Association of State Colleges and Universities

Background

The Association of State Colleges and Universities (ASCU) was established in 1961, making it the infant among the major associations representing higher education. With a membership of 235 institutions, the youthful Association is large. Although ASCU has slightly more than ten per cent of the institutions of higher education as members, its 235 member institutions enroll 1,200,000 students -- approximately one out of every five students enrolled in a degree program. From all indications, the percentage and number will increase rapidly.

By definition, member institutions are publicly supported. By constitutional decree, all must be regionally accredited. By current practice, all the member institutions are multi-purpose institutions, although almost all started as single purpose institutions. Eighty-three per cent of the member institutions were founded as teacher education institutions; 7 per cent were founded to serve agriculture, business, or industry; and 10 per cent have been founded very recently as multi-purpose institutions.

Member institutions range in enrollment from 250 to 23,000. Enrollment in state colleges and universities rose 180 per cent from 1956 to 1966. By 1975 enrollment is expected to increase in these institutions by another 110 per cent while overall college enrollments are expected to increase by 49 per cent. This increase means that within the next decade, one out of every three students in a degree program will be enrolled in a state college or university. In other words the percentage in a decade will increase from 20 to 33 per cent. Already state colleges and universities grant over one-fourth of the nation's bachelor's degrees and one-fifth of its master's degrees. With such rapid growth inevitably comes complex problems. Faculty recruitment, regional service, physical facilities, student housing -- all are part of the pattern of growth. No problem is of greater significance, however, than the conflict between the reach for universal educational opportunity and the search for adequate standards. One ASCU publication states the problem this way:

> They must find ways to reconcile a responsibility to the ideal of universal opportunity with the necessity to select students carefully for admission to major programs and to programs with professional or occupational goals. They must find ways to make it clear that no single standard equals excellence, but that excellence must be part of an infinite variety of standards.[1]

The Association has established close working relationships with other organizations. For example, ASCU and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges participate jointly on many projects, including research. Since 1966, the two groups hold concurrent annual meetings. Also the NASULGC's report on federal legislation -- Circular Letter -- is distributed to all ASCU members.

---

[1] "One Out of Five: the State Colleges and Universities in a Time of Expanding Responsibility," p. 7.

The Association also maintains a particularly close relationship with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Last year, 40 per cent of the nation's new elementary and secondary school teachers came from state colleges and universities. Over half the member institutions have graduate programs in education.

Purpose

The statement of purpose set forth in the Association's constitution declares:

> It is the principal purpose of the Association:
>
> 1. To improve higher education within its member institutions through cooperative planning, through studies and research on common educational problems, and through the development of a more unified program of action, and
>
> 2. To provide any other needed and worthwhile educational service to the colleges and universities it may represent.

In a brochure the question "What Are the Purposes of the Association of State Colleles and Universities?" is asked with the following answer:

> 1. To provide for a clearer view of the image of the state colleges and universities -
>   - internally among trustees, faculty, staff, and students,
>   - externally among local, state, and national communities, and among mediating agencies,
> 2. To provide a voice for state colleges and universities in the councils of government, business, industry, and educational societies,
> 3. To provide an avenue for communication and cooperation with other types of institutions for higher education, and
> 4. To provide a clearing house for the exchange of ideas and innovations in curriculum, organization, buildings, and personnel practices.
>
> TO THE END THAT
> -there will be a continuing emphasis upon excellence in our institutions.
> -there will be a greater understanding of the role and services of state colleges and universities.
> -there will be increased support of state colleges and universities at local, state, and national levels.[2]

---

[2] Ibid. p. 8.

Governance

ASCU is an institutional membership organization. Actually there are four types of membership: institutional, provisional, associate, and honorary. To qualify for institutional membership, the college must be wholly or partially state supported, must offer a program leading to the bachelor's degree, and must be regionally accredited. Institutional members are the only voting members.

Provisional membership is reserved for those institutions seeking regional accreditation while meeting all other requirements for institutional membership. Voting privileges are not granted and members may not hold office.

Associate membership is designed to cover individuals or agencies in related roles, such as state agencies. Honorary membership applies to both individuals and institutions. Walter Hager, a former executive director, was made an honorary member in 1966.

The dues schedule is based on enrollment, ranging from $100 for colleges with enrollments up to 500 to $800 for institutions with enrollments over 10,000. Provisional members pay the same dues as institutional members pay -- $100 annually.

The fiscal year coincides with the calendar year, except that dues payments are payable as of July 1.

Officers of the Association are: president, president-elect, immediate past president, treasurer, and executive director. Officers, except for the executive director, must be heads of member institutions.

Members of the board of directors include all the officers, except the executive director, and eight directors, two elected each year for four year terms. In all cases election is by a majority vote of the representatives voting at the annual meeting of the Association.

Currently the principal officers are: James P. Cornette, president (West Texas State University); Fred F. Harcleroad, president-elect (California State College at Haywood); and Allan W. Ostar, executive director.

The budget for 1967 called for an expenditure of $84,000 with almost the total sum coming from dues of member institutions. While the budget is modest and the financial position is satisfactory, the program cannot be too ambitious. Many fine projects are planned if they can be financed.

Activities

Among the projects currently under study are the following:

(1) Establishment of an ASCU Press to publish scholarly works,
(2) A cooperative artists bureau,

(3) A federal program office to assist members working with federal agencies,
(4) A program of workshops and consultant services,
(5) Exploration of new programs and curricula in the health related fields,
(6) Develop programs in international education,
(7) Establish research centers at member institutions,
(8) Consultant services to member institutions, and
(9) A national project to identify the role of state colleges and universities.

Within its structure is a series of standing committees; these include: Policies and Purposes, Studies, Federal Programs, Legislation, Workshops and Conferences, International Affairs, and Graduate Studies.

Another activity of significance is the cooperative work between ASCU and the National Commission on Accrediting. There are six members representing ASCU on the National Commission on Accrediting. These representatives are elected at the annual meeting.

The activities of the Association are reported to the membership through the newsletter - Memo. Specific activities are reported by means of study reports. All members also receive the NASULGC Circular Letter, M. M. Chambers' Grapevine, and the annual report of the Association.

Comments

(The observations noted below are the result of a meeting at the headquarters of the Association which included, in addition to this writer, Allan W. Ostar, executive director; George F. Budd, president of Kansas State College of Pittsburg and a member of the Association's executive committee; and G. Tyler Miller, president of Madison College, Virginia.)

It was assumed that the Association would grow in numbers and activities during the coming decade, but that its basic purposes would not be altered in any substantive manner. The Association is still young and still seeking the best pattern of service for its members.

The trends of significance for the future include the problem of growth. State colleges and universities will carry a heavy burden in increased enrollments at the collegiate level, but more problematic is the extension of educational opportunity beyond the high school. At issue will be the question of admissions as based on academic achievement. Can standards be preserved?

Another trend which must be confronted relates to the knowledge explosion and what it will subsequently mean in terms of organizing for teaching and innovation.

Faculty concerns in the decade ahead will remain essentially the same: salaries, teaching loads, and participation in governance.

The responses given to questions relating to NEA were clear. ASCU has found NEA very helpful; there has been a very good working relationship. However, in the world of higher education organizations, NEA is viewed as having an elementary - secondary school orientation. There is a growing tendency for organizations and individuals to look to the American Council on Education for leadership and guidance in higher education. ACE seems to be viewed by many of the executive heads in higher education throughout the Washington, D.C. complex as being similar to NEA but with a different sphere of operation with different points of influence. Noteworthy is the fact that many of the ACE family of organizations are -- like ASCU -- institutional associations, not individual faculty membership associations. The exceptions are: AAUP, AAHE, NFA, and AFT. Therefore, a legitimate question would be: How adequately are the concerns and problems of the individual faculty member being heard by associations with only institutional membership?

ASCU spokesmen felt that the annual conference put on by AAHE is good, but they quickly pointed out that ACE has strengthened its annual meeting by patterning its program after the AAHE in many ways. The quality of the papers at ACE are generally superior. (Remember that ACE pays to have the background papers prepared.) Discussion, they felt, was superior at ACE. One handicap to the AAHE meeting is the tendency for the conference to become a market place where professors seek new pastures. The question was raised: What is the function of AAHE? The answer they provided was "None." Dr. Ostar said, "There is no need for NEA to be involved in higher education except for teacher preparation and professional standards." The answer is based in part on two premises: (1) the individual faculty member is served through the learned societies and (2) the recent changes in ACE has given that organization a supreme position in higher education which NEA could only hope to duplicate.

The Association of American Colleges

Introduction

The Association of American Colleges was founded in 1915. Three years later it helped form the American Council on Education. Today the Association of American Colleges is one of the constituent organization members of ACE.

Its purpose is stated in the constitution

> ... shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges of liberal arts and sciences which shall become members of this association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.[1]

There are about 900 institutions which now belong to the association. As of January 1, 1968, the dues structure is as follows:

Colleges with a full-time equivalent student enrollment up to 500.	$250.00
Colleges with a full-time equivalent student enrollment of 501-2,000.	$300.00
Colleges with a full-time equivalent student enrollment of 2,001 or more.	$350.00

Governance

The Association of American Colleges has institutional membership and honorary members do not vote although they have all other rights. Unless otherwise stated, the president is the official delegate. Each member institutions is entitled to a single vote.

The annual meeting is in January. The theme of the annual meeting in 1967 was "Liberal Learning and the Learning Community." It was held in Los Angeles, California.

The Board of Directors is made up of the officers, the immediate past chairman, the president, and four elected directors. Elected directors serve four year terms and are not eligible for re-election. Within the constitutions and by-laws, the Board of Directors are authorized to manage the affairs of the Association. Richard D. Weigle, President of St. John's College, is the 1967-68 chairman. Richard H. Sullivan is president and executive head.

The major body of the work is done by the commissions. Currently there are five commissions: Liberal Learning, Religion in Higher Education, Students and Faculty, College Administrations and College and Society. The reports of the commissions and all other annual summaries are carried in the March issue of Liberal Education, the bulletin of the Association of American Colleges.

---

[1] "Constitution of the Association of American Colleges, Inc." reprinted in Liberal Education, LIII: 1 (March 1967), 151.

Budget

The budget for the Association reflects total assets of $652,237.25 as of December 31, 1966. There are five funds within the budget: operating, program, restricted, reserve, and plant. The operating fund set up a budget of $192,200 of which $179,020.45 was actually spent. Payment of membership dues provided $130,500. The balance was made up from unrestricted grants and transfers from restricted funds. Thus, it can be seen that dues payments do not support in full the Association and its activities.

Comments

Dr. Richard H. Sullivan assumed the presidency on February 1, 1967 after the untimely death of Carter Davidson. Prior to his appointment, Sullivan had been president of Reed College in Portland, Oregon.

In his comments, Dr. Sullivan noted a trend with a problem -- the mounting cost of higher education and the need to explore different patterns of financing higher education. The lines between tax supported and non-tax supported institutions are not as clear as they once were. Financial assistance from the Federal government has recognized a unity in higher education and has supported extensive programs and grants in both public and private colleges. In less obvious ways the lines are not being observed. For example, Lady Barbara Ward, economist and author, has been appointed Schweitzer professor of international economics at Columbia University -- a private institution -- but will be paid by the State of New York.

Sullivan has envisioned state scholarships grants to students to be used in either private or public institutions. This question and many existing practices will force a clarification of the ageless -- church -- state question.

The American Association of Junior Colleges

Background

The December 7, 1967 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education carried a front page story "74 New Junior Colleges Open". Story developments indicated that 74 new junior colleges opened in the fall of 1967, including Nevada Community College. Addition of the institution in Nevada provides at least one junior college in each of the fifty states. In numbers California heads the list with 90 junior colleges -- about 10 per cent of the total. During the same period enrollment jumped 15 per cent over the previous year for a total of 1,465,000. This means that junior college enrollment had doubled in this decade. Behind this surge of activity are many forces and one outstanding organization -- The American Association of Junior Colleges.

The constitution declares that AAJC shall:

> ...promote the sound growth of community and junior colleges and shall help create in them an atmosphere conducive to learning. Thus we will direct our activities toward the development of good teaching, suitable curriculums, effective administration, appropriate student guidance services, and communication with local, state, and national communities. We believe that through our mutual endeavors we can advance these goals.

Membership is institutional; however, other organizations, associations, and individuals may become affiliates of AAJC. Currently there are 704 institutional members, 45 organizations and associations, and about 600 individual affiliations. Another 60 to 75 institutions are expected to join in 1968.

Dues are based on the size of the institution.

Governance

Policy is developed by the Board of Directors, a body of twelve junior college administrators elected by the representatives of institutions holding active membership. At the present time Donald A. Eldridge, president of Bennett College, is the elected president of AAJC. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., as executive director, heads a professional staff of thirteen.

There are five commissions in the structure with sixteen members each: administration, curriculum, instruction, legislation and student personnel. The chairmen of the five commissions, the president, the vice-president, and the executive director form the membership on the important Council on Research and Service which coordinates the work of the commissions.

Each year an annual convention is held. This year the meeting will be in Boston at the end of February. "Selected Papers" from the annual convention are published. In addition an annual report is published each spring which contains brief reports of the Association's activities and affairs.

The latest financial review is for 1966. Of a total income of $330,235 only $146,562 came from dues: A vigorous publications program provided almost $100,000 for operations. On the expenditure side, the association spent $308,584, leaving a surplus for 1966 of $21,651. In addition AAJC disbursed $271,983 from restricted funds for special projects. Looking ahead to 1967, the financial report observed that even with a proposed increase, dues income will total only $200,000 of a $700,000 budget. Certainly such a financial position restricts the program of the Association because a large part of its activities must be restricted to those specific tasks supported by outside grants. Many times the grants are given for special studies or activities which are only incidental to the primary purpose of AAJC.

History

The American Association of Junior Colleges was established in 1920. Actually the formation of AAJC was the result of a meeting called in 1920 by the U. S. Bureau of Education (now the U.S. Office of Education) to discuss junior colleges. James Madison Wood, President of Stephens College, was one of the leading figures in the call. His affectionate title was "Mr. Junior College" and as a token of the respect his colleagues had for him, St. Louis, Missouri, the home state of Stephens College, was chosen as the site for the meeting. Another leading spirit in the organizational drive was Dr. George F. Zook, then specialist in higher education for the U. S. Bureau of Education. The meeting was begun June 30 and ended July 1 with thirty-four people present. There were in 1920 about 175 institutions which could be broadly defined as junior colleges.

Energy for the next two decades was largely devoted to identifying and defining the role of the junior college. After World War II the Association faced its most crucial period. Conflicts were serious and the future appeared dark. Out of the near chaos came a new executive secretary -- Jesse Parker Bogue. For twelve years Bogue worked to calm the disputes which threatened to destroy AAJC and he streamlined the organizations internal operations. From near disaster arose the vibrant Association which Bogue turned over to the current executive director -- Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. -- in 1958. Gleazer, with brilliant help from William G. Shannon, the associate executive director, has continued to design and develop an association as vigorous and dynamic as the institutions which hold membership.[1]

Activities

In addition to its commissions, the AAJC is involved in other special projects supported by foundations or agencies. One example is the Occupational Education Bulletin designed to provide information helpful in the development of semi-professional and technical education programs in two-year colleges. The project is supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

---

[1] For a history of AAJC from its beginnings to 1963 see Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement by Michael Brick.

Other projects underway or recently completed include:

- -National projects to recruit and prepare men and women for teaching in junior colleges
- -A program of facilities planning
- -A national project on articulation between two-year and four-year colleges and universities
- -A national study of issues, problems, and interests of junior college faculty members
- -An appraisal of student personnel services in junior and community colleges

Another service provided by AAJC is its Professional Advisory Service. This service is provided to communities, institutions, organizations, and agencies concerned with junior college program development.

The Junior College Journal with a circulation of 21,000, is published eight times a year (September through May with December and January issues combined). In addition the publications catalog carries a listing of about twenty-five separate publications available for sale.

Comments

(The comments which follow are based upon an interview with William G. Shannon, associate executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges.)

Among the major changes Dr. Shannon predicted for the decade ahead were:

1. The expansion of occupational education programs in the two-year colleges with a greater acceptance by the academic community of both the programs and the instructors.

2. The extension of educational opportunity to larger segments of society through the expansion of the two-year college system.

3. The sensitive response on the part of all higher education but especially junior colleges to societal problems. Programs of continuing education are an illustration of that response.

4. The growing involvement of the Federal government in the field of higher education. One illustration is the potential in the Education Professions Development Act.

There is a definite concern being expressed about the role of the faculty in the junior college. The concern has both external and internal implications for AAJC. Externally, the junior college is perceived as a "unique" institution not a high school and not a university. It must be free to develop its own identity related to its purpose. AAJC seems to have given support to state and regional associations composed of institutional memberships, but including sections composed of faculty. Four state associations now have full-time executives: California, Oregon, Illinois, and Michigan. The California Junior College Association has a history dating back to 1930. Currently in California there are 83 institutional members with four more expected to be added during the 1967-68 academic year. The independence of these new state associations seems to please AAJC and there is little doubt but what this pattern is preferred over the National Faculty Association sponsored by the NEA. Dr. Shannon concluded that, "NFA is okay, but state and regional associations are more meaningful."

Last year Roger Garrison, then a member of the AAJC staff, did a national study of junior college faculty problems. The findings were published by AAJC -- Junior College Faculty Issues and Problems. Garrison did a fine job of recapitulating the issues and problems of the junior college faculty members as they go through an identity crisis, which in many respects is parallel to the institutional crises of 1920 and 1946.

Garrison's conclusions seem to have the concurrence of the AAJC leadership; however, the internal decision by the Board of Directors was that AAJC should remain an institutional organization. If faculty members are to become involved in campus governances, the means which AAJC perceives as appropriate would be state and regional associations.

The American Association of University Professors

Background

In the spring of 1913, a letter signed by eighteen full professors on the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University was sent to persons of equal rank at nine other leading universities, urging them to join in the formation of a national association of professors. To the signers of the original letter there seemed to be a need for an organization to serve their institutional and societal needs quite apart from the academic societies. Six hundred fifty professors became charter members and in January, 1915, the American Association of University Professors was formed.[1] Three years later the AAUP was to join with thirteen other associations in forming the American Council on Education. Today AAUP is one of the constituent organization members of ACE.

One of its first acts was to appoint a committee on academic freedom and tenure. This committee, known today as Committee A, drafted the "Declaration of Principles" at the request of the first president - John Dewey.

Throughout the more than half century of its existence, the original concerns for academic freedom and tenure have been sustained. In 1925 a conference was held by the American Council on Education to revise the 1915 statement: the result was the "1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure." In 1940 with the Association of American Colleges a revised policy statement was developed, the "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure." This statement was endorsed by many groups, including in 1950 the Association for Higher Education. Later -- in 1958 -- the Association of American Colleges and AAUP prepared the "1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings" to supplement the 1940 Statement. From these beginnings numerous statements on related topics were subsequently published. In 1966 Committee T on College and University Government, in cooperation with ACE and the Associations of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, published the "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (1966)".[2] Finally in 1967, AAUP published Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors edited by Louis Joughin, Associate Secretary of AAUP.

A twin concern in recent years has been the salary studies done by Committee Z on the Economic Status of the Profession. Since 1958 an annual self-grading salary survey has been conducted. In 1965-66, 905 colleges and universities participated in the survey. This survey, published annually in the AAUP Bulletin (Summer), has become a bench mark for salary discussions on all campuses throughout the nation.

---

[1] For a more detailed account see Walter P. Metzger, "Origins of the Association: An Anniversary Address", AAUP Bulletin (Summer 1965) 229-237.

[2] See AAUP Bulletin (Winter 1966).

Purpose

The purpose of AAUP as set forth in the constitution is as follows:

> Its purpose shall be to facilitate a more effective cooperation among teachers and research scholars in universities and colleges, and in professional schools of similar grade, for the promotion of the interests of higher education and research, and in general to increase the usefulness and advance the standards, ideals, and welfare of the profession.[3]

In one of its brochures, AAUP makes this statement: "Vigorous in defense of academic standards and in the promotion of faculty welfare, the Association has come to be recognized as the authoritative voice of the profession."[4]

Membership currently is listed at 85,000. Charter memberships were 1,362. Members represent approximately 1,600 institutions of higher education. In addition to regional and state organizations, there are over 1,000 local chapters on campuses in fifty states.

There are four classes of membership: Active, Junior, Associate, and Emeritus. One wishing to become a member makes application and, following determination of his eligibility, he is notified of his acceptance or rejection. Dues range from $8.00 to $15.00 for active members, based upon the applicant's salary for the academic year.

Governance

There are six officers of the association. The president, first vice-president, and second vice-president are elected by the active members of the association. The general secretary, treasurer, and general counsel are appointed by the Council (Board of Directors). Elected officers serve a two year term. The governing board is the Council. Memberships on the Council include the six officers, the chairman of the Assembly of State and Regional Conferences, the three latest living ex-presidents, and 30 elected members. Clark Byse (Law) of Harvard University is the president. Bertram H. Davis is the general secretary. Headquarters are at 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. Each year there is a national meeting. The fifty-third annual meeting was held in Cleveland, Ohio, April 28-29, 1967. The annual budget is currently about $1,000,000 with about sixty-five per cent of the receipts coming from dues.

Activities

The complex activities of the Association are largely reflected by the multiple standing and special committees. Beginning with the historic Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure the list covers ethics, teaching, accrediting, chapters, membership, international academic affairs, history, investments,

---

[3] See "Constitutions of the Association", Article I, reprinted in AAUP Bulletin (Summer 1967), 243-245.

[4] Brochure entitled "Support Your Professional Association."

Bulletin, organization and policy, governmental relations, faculty responsibility for the academic freedom of students, college and university government, to Committee Z on the Economic Status of the Profession. In addition there are special committees on such subjects as: state legislation affecting academic freedom, security measures, copyright law revision, academic personnel ineligible for tenure, bargaining and sanctions, developing institutions, organization relations, academic freedom at church-related institutions, and junior colleges.

The many activities are reported to the memberships by means of the AAUP Bulletin and Academe, the newsletter of the Association.

Action items are reported to the delegates at the annual meeting of the Association.

Comments

(The comments which follow are developed from the notes I took during my conference with Bertram H. Davis, General Secretary; Walter P. Fidler, Deputy General Secretary; and Louis Joughim, Associate Secretary.)

AAUP has noted an expanding interest in recent years in the area of professional negotiations. One reflection of the new interest is the Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities published jointly by AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. This trend has forced AAUP to expand its concerns. For example, it is now necessary to display greater concern to the non-tenured academic person. It is now necessary to display greater concern for faculty involvement in the accrediting process. In addition, AAUP has sustained its concern for academic freedom and tenure; however, through special studies new areas of concern are being examined. A second and related shift in program is to be noted in the greater attention given to local chapters and to the training of local leaders. A noteworthy step recently taken is the opening of a regional office in San Francisco so as to serve better the local and regional chapters on the West Coast.

It was felt that AAUP despite its Committee C on College and University Teaching could not do an adequate job. AAHE, according to Dr. Fidler, is competent to fill this void. The void includes special research studies on teaching via television, training teachers, programmed instruction, analyzing the effectiveness of the newer media. The NEA-AAHE is well-suited to this type of work. In part it was felt that the annual conference of AAHE was serving this end.

Another gap recognized by the AAUP which AAHE could fill is related to the U. S. Office of Education. The heavy demands being made on the staff of USOE as a result of the new programs have made it impossible for that office to complete research studies for which data are collected. For example, in 1966 it was reported that USOE scheduled over fifty research studies but completed only five. For 1967 there were thirty-three studies scheduled and this schedule cannot be met. AAHE could contract to produce these studies by using USOE collected data.

The reports are helpful to higher education and the failure to complete the reports is creating an informational gap.

Dr. Fidler suggested one other illustrative case of needed research of the nature NEA-AAHE could perform is in the field of reading at the college level. While there are many programs at the college level designed to improve the reading ability of students, there has been little research evidence collected to measure the output of such programs.

In summary, the AAUP spokesman seemed interested in pushing NEA-AAHE into teaching preparation and research fields so as to leave open to AAUP the areas of professional negotiations and campus chapter organization.

Another recent development is the increased interest AAUP is showing in the community-junior college field. There is a special committee of nine members (including two from community colleges) set up on junior colleges. The spokesmen stated that there were about 200 community colleges represented by the 5000-7000 individual members of AAUP teaching in community colleges. Cited as a show place of AAUP efficacy is Jamestown Junior College in New York. With a faculty of 85, the AAUP recruited 72 members and won tenure provisions for the faculty. However, the field also represents some problems for AAUP. As one of the spokesmen put it: "What do you do with the cosmetologist?" "Perhaps the NEA could help," was one suggestion.

The AAUP must recruit a larger percentage of the potential members to support its program. In 1957 there were 36,415 members. A decade later there were 80,142 with a predicted enrollment of 90,000 by January 1, 1968. By 1980 the Association hoped to have 35 per cent of the teaching and research faculty members enrolled.

Also by 1980 many of the present innovations should be established facts. Collective bargaining at the campus level with AAUP playing a supportive role is one idea which will mature. Another is the increased role of AAUP as a consultative agent rather than a direct participant. Related to these developments is the strengthening of campus chapters and greater activity at the state level with both served by a net-work of regional offices.

In conclusion Louis Joughim volunteered that "We (AAUP) would think it would be a wonderful thing if AAHE could have ten professional staff members under Kerry Smith." The AAUP has fourteen professional staff members.

Special Comment

(When the discussion reached the point where the list of questions was exhausted, I brought up one question not before us for discussion. My question was this: Would AAUP consider establishing a relationship with the NEA? The comments below are for your information and do not reflect any official view of any spokesman. The matter should be treated with discretion.)

The response was not an emphatic "NO". Instead the discussion turned to questions of autonomy. Could the AAUP remain an autonomous organization within the NEA structure? How would AAUP relate to other NEA groups in higher education? Needless to say the great concern had to do with the fierce pride generated by over fifty years of gallant service to a prestigious segment of higher education.

What made the suggestion even worthy of discussion is the serious financial dilemma confronting the organization. AAUP cannot remain small, select, and -- therefore -- prestigious if it hopes to remain effective. It must grow and to grow it must provide more services, more direct services to individual members so as to make the Association professionally significant and economically essential. All one needs to do is to examine the budget to comprehend the agony of the dilemma. In 1966 membership dues netted $664,656.51 for a net revenue of $695,419.99. When the latter figure is compared to an expenditure of $759,655.55, one sees a deficit of $64,245.56. Nineteen sixty-seven is not much brighter. Anticipated dues revenue is $915,000 for a total revenue of $947,550 and expenditures of $1,000.103.24, which leaves another large deficit of $52,553.24.

	1966	1967(estimated)
Dues Revenue	664,656.51	915,000.00
Total Reserve	695,419.99	947,550.00
Expenditures	759,665.55	1,000,103.24
Deficit	64,245.56	52,553.24

Thus it can be seen that while AAUP might wish to sustain its historic independence it must find a better financial arrangement. This result prohibits any emphatic "NO" to merger discussions.

American Federation of Teachers

NOTE: The AFT was not interviewed. A list of questions was given to Dick Dashiell of Urban Services, NEA. The questions and answers appear below. When Mr. Dashiell is quoted directly his remarks are enclosed in quotes.

1. QUESTION: What is the primary purpose of the organization?

ANSWER: The primary purpose of the AFT is to gain welfare benefits for members through collective bargaining.

2. QUESTION: What was the membership in higher education in 1957, in 1967, and what is projected for 1980?

ANSWER: There was a very small membership in 1957 - "it could be measured in milligrams."

"The role today is one of driving for members among the junior and community colleges. In California, there are some 21 or 22 organizers working in the vineyards of higher education. The AFT organizers are also particularly active in Illinois, Michigan and New York state. I strongly suspect that they will soon make a pitch for organizing the junior colleges in Florida. Their largest local is New York City where there are more than 700 members of the New York City (and Kings Point Chapter) College Teachers Local #1460. The AFT claims a membership of some 4,000 college teachers, but, as with all its figures, you have to accept that with several grains of saline."

3. QUESTION: What are the conditions which foster growth?

ANSWER: The conditions that foster growth at the collegiate level in the AFT are apathy and disinterestedness on the part of the state and local professional associations, and dissatisfaction by the faculties with salary, conditions of teaching, and recognition. Some associations couldn't care less about higher education people. As an example of what I'm talking about, the day before my son reported for duty as a Teaching Assistant at the University of California at Berkeley, he was called upon by the AFT to become a member. He hasn't seen a CTA or an NEA man yet."

4. QUESTION: What role do you see the AFT performing in 1980?

ANSWER: "1980? My clouded crystal ball tells me that if the NEA and its affiliates don't get on the stick, the AFT's role and influence will supplant that of the NEA, the AAUP, et al. Whether the AFT will finally become concerned with academic matters, per se, is another question."

The United States Office of Education Bureau of Higher Education

Background

Congressman James A. Garfield spoke to the National Teachers' Association in Indianapolis in 1866. He explained his motives for indtroducing in the Congress the bill which was to create the Department of Education. His hopes were fulfilled in 1867. Actually the partnership between the Federal Government and higher education began with the passage of the First Morrill Act, July 2, 1862. Over a century later, when signing the Higher Education Act of 1965, President Johnson described it as "...the noblest act of promise any Congress has ever created."The long partnership will continue and activities in this sector will grow rapidly in the years to come.

Today there are thirty programs relating to higher education which are handled through the Bureau of Higher Education of the United States Office of Education. The range of programs include: instructional inprovement (12 programs with 27 grants) facilities (3 programs), general student financial aid (6 programs), aid for study in specific areas (8programs and 21 grants), research (17 grants), and support of community activities (11 grants).

As a part of the general survey of the field of higher education, two men representing the U.S. Office of Education were interviewed: (1) Dr. Peter P. Muirhead, Associate Commissioner for Higher Education; and (2) Dr. James Rogers, Specialist for Faculty Staffing, Division of College Support. Their comments appear below.

Interview with Peter P. Muirhead

In the opinion of Dr. Muirhead, the greatest NEA Contribution can be made in the area of curriculum development, especially at the community-junior college level. AAJC has a commission on curriculum, but it does not have the staff to fill this void..

"NEA might play a more vigorous role in explaining the field of higher education. Aprototype might be the role now played by NEA lin the elementary-secondary field." A more precise example would be the field of legislation; NEA has been quite mute where higher education is concerned. More precisely, NEA could provide a forum in the area of legislation for the voice of the faculty member to be heard - ACE does not do this.

Ironically, it was in the area of legislation that NEA did more to alienate itself with groups in higher education than any other single thing. The issue was the proposed higher education facilities bill which was pending before the Congress in 1962. NEA, through its Legislative commission, took a stand for aid to public higher education only. This action had two results in the minds of many. First, it weakened the support for the bill and thus caused its defeat. (The bill was. passed in 1963 with NEA Playing essentially a silent role.) Second, it provided evidence to many skeptics that NEA with its elementary-secondary orientation did not comprehend higher education and, therefore, was not qualified to speak for it. From the ebb tide, the times have brightened somewhat, but NEA has not assumed a position in the arena of legislation for higher education comparable to that it rightfully occupies on elementary-secondary legislation.

In response to the question of how to appeal to the faculty member, Dr. Muirhead replied: "Leadership should be in the area of teacher strategy--curriculum design, effective patterns of teaching with technological media. There is a need to break out of the cocoon of academic disciplines. An inter-disciplinary approach must be found. Thus the NEA can make a genuine contribution to the improvement of college teaching."

Dr. Muirhead was asked this question: What in your opinion are the two or three major trends which will be shaping higher education for the next decade and beyond? One trend he identified carried with it a problem. The trend is the extension of equal educational opportunity beyond the high school for all who wish it and can benefit from it. This trend means that a higher percentage of the college-age population will be enrolling in college, and it also means that many more Negroes will be going to college. The problem related to the trend is that new techniques or organizing knowledge must be found if higher education is to be relevant.

Two other trends were identified: (1) the increasing role of the community-junior college as an institution with a comprehensive post-secondary program and (2) an increasingly important role for higher education in a society seeking to live a life of significance in an urbanized society. This trend, because it is oft repeated, tends to sound trite; nevertheless, solution is important, and higher education is the means not only to elevate the concern above the trite but to breathe into the dream the essence of significance. The NEA could become the most powerful agent shaping the trends into operable policy and practice.

Interview with James Rogers

Dr. Rogers stressed the fact that in the field of higher education, "AAHE multiplies its influence far beyond its numbers through the national conference." While almost every person interviewed spoke with genuine sincerity in praising the national conference and its widespread influence throughout all facets of higher education, none put the statement more clearly than Dr. Rogers.

He also pointed out with some care and in considerable detail the changing function of the U.S. Office of Education. New programs growing out of legislation are requiring the office to do program research, design, evaluation, development, etc., and to forego annual studies and surveys. (One person with considerable feeling pointed out that more than fifty surveys were undertaken by USOE a year ago and fewer than ten percent were completed due to the pressures placed on the Bureau of Higher Education by its changing function. The raw data are collected but not tabulated, analyzed and printed.) Some agency, perhaps NEA, is needed to provide the consultative work, to do the annual surveys, and to produce the needed research. The statistics will be gathered by the Statistics Division of the USOE. However, administering programs now take the full time of the Bureau.

Who is the community-junior college expert in the Bureau of Higher Education? Dr. Rogers could identify no one at this time. It is true that the table of organization for the Bureau of Higher Education does not reflect any office which by title indicates that it is primarily concerned with the rapidly growing two-year college segment. Similarly, it is true that the two-year colleges have not fared as well as have the other segments of higher education in the legislative sphere. As of the moment, counselors in two-year colleges are offered Federal programs under the NDEA. Other elements of the staff are not covered at this time.

NEA could become the catalyst in the change process through consultative work on program design and development, through surveys, and through research in higher education. The results would provide the raw material for the development of proposals. In fact, NEA could become the grantee to do some of the studies. To ;urge these opportunities to fruition requires a staff of specialists which NEA does not now possess and for which it lacks the policy to develop.

As for discernible trends, Dr. Rogers mentioned the obvious. Assuming sustained prosperity and no major war and suspension of the drain on the economy resulting from the nation's commitment in Viet-Nam, the role of the Federal government in higher education will grow rapidly in the next decade. This trend requires innovation. It requires an organized group to interpret the new research by turning it to classroom practice. NEA can fill this void.

A growing involvement in higher education by the Federal government burdens professional education bodies with the need for political involvement. It is not enough, Dr.Rogers observed, to follow legislative progress. Progress must be generated through leadership which promotes and guides legislative proposals and action. Even more practical, some educational group must become concerned with the political realities of the committee appointments in the Congress and the key appointments in the Executive branch. NEA can provide leadership.

NEA could do more than it is now doing to integrate the diversity of forces in higher education. One concrete example is the need to raise a clear voice for the two-year college on the Hill where there now is only a faint whisper. NEA can be the voice.

Finally, NEA's voice in higher education in the future will have to be more a faculty voice. "This is where the problems are, this is where the needs are, and this is where the people are." Faculty involvement can come through an individual membership organization with a concern for a unified education program and the NEA can organize the faculty involvement.